This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
MDCCCCX
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
MDCCCCX
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Fenner sculp. Paternoster Row.

WILLIAM OUTRAM, D.D.

Prebendary of Westminster.

BORN 1625 DIED 1679.

Published June 12. 1822. by Henry Gonce & Co. Pater Noster Row.

TWO DISSERTATIONS

ON

SACRIFICES:

THE FIRST

ON ALL THE SACRIFICES OF THE JEWS,

WITH REMARKS ON SOME OF THOSE OF THE HEATHENS;

THE SECOND

ON THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST:

IN BOTH WHICH THE GENERAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ON THESE SUBJECTS IS DEFENDED AGAINST THE SOCINIANS.

BY

WILLIAM OUTRAM, D.D.

FORMERLY PREBENDARY OF WESTMINSTER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES AND INDEXES,

BY JOHN ALLEN,

AUTHOR OF MODERN JUDAISM, &c. &c.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE TRANSLATOR;

AND SOLD BY HENRY GOODE AND CO.

QUEEN'S-HEAD PASSAGE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1828.

686 So

R. Clay, Printer, 9, Devonshire Street, Bishopsgate.

THE

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

The design of the following Dissertations is to defend the doctrine of Atonement for sin by the Death of Christ: —a doctrine which exhibits the only foundation of scriptural hope, has an essential connexion with every other part of the gospel system, and extends its influence to all the duties and privileges of the Christian life. One irrefragable argument in support of this doctrine, arises from the correspondence and typical relation between the priestly office and sacrifices under the Mosaic law, and the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. This argument is here stated and enforced, in a manner at once clear, concise, comprehensive, and, as the Translator conceives, satisfactory.

Some Christians consider the sacrifice of Christ as offered particularly and exclusively for those who shall eventually be saved; and others believe, as did Dr. Outram,* that it was offered indefinitely and generally on the behalf of mankind. The pious advocates of these different views profess an equal reliance on the Saviour's atonement for pardon of sin, and deduce from it the same obligations to holiness of heart and life; and in the statements and reasonings of this work, for the most part, they will equally coincide.

* The Author's name was *Owtram*, but latinizing it for this work he wrote it *Outramus:* and this way of spelling, without the termination, has been so generally retained, that the Translator thought it best to conform to it.—Dr. Outram was a native of Derbyshire, and born in the year 1625. He was entered of Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A. and obtained a fellowship. In 1649 he took his degree of M.A. and in 1660 that of D.D. He was presented to the rectory of St. Mary Woolnoth in London; afterwards, in 1669, he was collated to the archdeaconry of Leicester; and during the following year he was installed prebendary of St. Peter's church in Westminster. In 1677 he published the work, of which the present volume is a translation. He died in 1679.

The reason of its being originally written in Latin was, doubtless, because the writings of Socinus and his earlier disciples were almost wholly in that language. The circumstances of the present times have suggested its translation into English. Few books of doctrinal theology have obtained such concurrent testimonies of high approbation from the most competent judges among Christians of various communions; and though the same principles have been ably defended in numerous treatises, this work cannot justly be considered as at all superseded by any other that has yet appeared.

The opposition now made to the doctrine here maintained, differs, indeed, from the manner in which it was opposed by the Socinians of the seventeenth century, with whom the author was called to contend. But their successors of the present day differ from them on this subject, principally in wider deviations from the plain and obvious import of the phraseology of the sacred

writers, and a more open disregard of scriptural authority. And if the argument of these Dissertations has any force against the disciples of *Socinus* and *Crellius*, it must possess still greater validity against the followers of *Priestley* and *Lindsey*.—The point at issue is infinitely important. If ATONEMENT FOR SIN BY THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST be not a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, it may be justly affirmed,—that the language of the scriptures leads to gross and mischievous error;—that the Jewish ritual was a mass of unmeaning ceremonies;—and that there is no harmony between the law and the gospel, the prophets and the apostles, the Old Testament and the New:—conclusions never to be admitted by minds that reverence the scriptures, or Him who inspired them.

The object aimed at in the translation has been a faithful exhibition of the sentiments of the Author. In a few instances of verboseness, a fault more rare in DR.

OUTRAM than, in most writers of his age, the Translator has taken the liberty of using a little compression; but, he believes it will be found, without omitting any of the ideas of the original. The quotations from the rabbies, fathers, and classics, he has thought it sufficient to present to the reader in English, without inserting the originals, except in some particular cases which required their insertion. A few sentences which interrupted the continuity of the discourse, are removed from the text, and thrown into notes; and two or three passages are left untranslated, for a reason which must be too obvious to need explanation.

It can scarcely be necessary to remark, that in avowing a high estimate of the merit of the work, and an acquiescence in its general argument, the Translator must not be understood as professing an entire approbation of every sentiment it contains. He has occasionally ventured to state his difference of opinion in a note: and he is

responsible for all those notes which are preceded by the letters TR.

He concludes by expressing his hopes, that the usefulness of the work will be extended by the form in which it is now published, and that it will be the means of establishing many in that doctrine, which, though regarded by some as a stumbling block, and by others rejected as foolishness, has in all ages approved itself to the understandings and hearts of multitudes as truly divine.

LONDON,
April 15, 1817.

ERRATUM.

Page 191, last line but one. *For* north-eastern *read* south-eastern.

CONTENTS.

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

DISSERTATION I.

CHAPTER I.

Opinions and Arguments on the Origin of Sacrifices 7

CHAPTER II.

The Places used for offering Sacrifices 31

CHAPTER III.

The proper Nature and Design of the Tabernacle and Temple, 41

CHAPTER IV.

The Ministers of Sacrifices 54

CHAPTER V.

The Consecration of the Aaronic Priests 65

CHAPTER VI.

The Integrity of Life, Perfection of Body, and Purity of Family, required in the Aaronic Priests 77

CHAPTER VII.

The Levites 89

CHAPTER VIII.

The Nature and different Kinds of Sacrifices, according to the Jews. Particular Account of the Meat Offerings 94

Page

CHAPTER IX.

The Selection of Victims practised among the Jews 113

CHAPTER X.

Enumeration of all the Kinds of Victims appointed in the Law of Moses. Particular Account of the Burnt Offerings... 120

CHAPTER XI.

The Peace Offerings, and those which may be classed with Peace Offerings, such as the Firstlings and the Tithes 128

CHAPTER XII.

The Piacular Sacrifices called Sin Offerings 139

CHAPTER XIII.

The Piacular Victims called Trespass Offerings. The Paschal Sacrifice..... 149

CHAPTER XIV.

The Sacrifices of the Whole Congregation of Israel 164

CHAPTER XV.

Certain Sacrificial Rites; particularly, the Offering and Waving of the Victims, the Imposition of Hands upon their Heads, and the Prayers connected with that Ceremony.... 173

CHAPTER XVI.

The Killing of the Victims, the Sprinkling of the Blood, the Flaying, and the Manner in which the Victims were to be cut up..... 189

CHAPTER XVII.

Some Victims to be burned without the Camp: others to be eaten..... 206

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Nature and Design of a Sacred Type. Which of the Jewish Sacrifices the Principal Types of the Sacrifice of Christ..... 215

CHAPTER XIX.

Proofs that the Efficacy of all the Sacrifices primarily and properly had respect, not to Men, but to God 229

Page

CHAPTER XX.

Proofs that the Jews considered their Sacrifices as having respect to God, and that the Heathens believed their Sacrifices to have respect to their Deities. The Opinion of the Christian Fathers concerning these Rites 249

CHAPTER XXI.

Vicarious Punishment explained, and Proofs that it was inflicted on the Piacular Victims 260

CHAPTER XXII.

That Piacular Victims, by a Vicarious Punishment, expiated those Sins on Account of which they were sacrificed, shown to have been the Opinion of the ancient Christians and Jews, as well as of the Heathens 277

DISSERTATION II.

CHAPTER I.

The general Business of Christ's Priesthood; the Order to which it belongs; and the Things by which he was especially consecrated to this Office 293

CHAPTER II.

Proofs that the Scriptures attribute to Christ a real Priesthood, properly so called 301

CHAPTER III.

To what Class of Sacrifices the Sacrifice of Christ belongs, and in what it consists 313

CHAPTER IV.

The Efficacy of that Obedience which Christ rendered to God in offering himself to die 319

CHAPTER V.

The Death of Christ. Passages of Scripture which represent his Death as designed to be a Vicarious Punishment 326

Page

CHAPTER VI.

Passages of Scripture which represent Atonement as effected by the Death of Christ 341

CHAPTER VII.

The Oblation by which Christ presented himself to God in Heaven, as a Piacular Victim previously slain for our Sins. Arguments to show that Christ did this in order to commend to God both Us and our Services in general, and our Prayers in particular. The true Nature of his Intercession 361

Index of Principal Matters 383
Index of Texts explained or referred to 390
Notes added by the Translator 400

INTRODUCTION.

SOME years ago, in a conversation with that very venerable prelate John Lord Bishop of Rochester, respecting the Sacrifice of Christ, I recited my opinion on that subject from a sermon which I had preached a great while before. When I had finished reading it, the Right Reverend Father, whose authority and judgment both had considerable weight with me, immediately advised me to a more extended discussion in Latin, of those points which I had touched on in a brief and cursory manner in my English discourse. As soon as I had undertaken it, I considered that my first task must be an attentive examination of the principal Socinian writers, with whom I perceived my controversy would chiefly lie. Whoever peruses their works will find them to have formed such notions of the death of Jesus Christ, and of his sacrifice which they always separate from his death, that they have expressly denied every idea of vicarious suffering to the former, and supposed that no favour with God is obtained for us by the latter; concluding that though the influence of his death may in some respect extend to God, yet the efficacy of his sacrifice terminates upon men. And these sentiments are still maintained by all the followers of Socinus.

Nor is their confidence in these opinions at all shaken by the declarations of the scripture, that "Christ bare our sins," that he "died for us," that he "died for our sins," that he "gave himself for "our sins," that he "gave his life a ransom for many," that he "gave himself a ransom for all," that he "suffered that he might sanctify the people with his "own blood," that his "blood" was "shed for the "remission of sins," that he "maketh intercession "for us," that he is our "advocate with the Fa-"ther."* They pretend that all these expressions, and any others of a similar kind that may be adduced, will easily admit of a different sense from that which has been attributed to them by the Christian Church for many ages; and that a different one must of necessity be attributed to them, if we would follow the dictates of reason. To *bear sins*, in the scriptures, they admit, does sometimes denote *bearing the punishment of sins;* but they plead that it also signifies to *bear away sins*, that is, to abolish or remit them: whence God is said by Moses "to bear "sins,"† that is, to forgive them. To *die for us* they consider as not at all implying vicarious punishment, since we ourselves are commanded "to lay down "our lives for the brethren,"‡ if the circumstances of the times require it; though no one has ever pretended it to be our duty to atone for their sins. Nor have the other expressions any greater weight with them. They understand the assertion, that "Christ

* I Pet. ii. 24. Rom. v. 8. I Cor. xv. 3. Gal. i. 4. Matt. xx. 28. I Tim. ii. 6. Heb. xiii. 12. Matt. xxvi. 28. Rom. viii. 34. I John ii. 1.

† נשא Exod. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 18.

‡ I John iii. 16.

"died for our sins," as importing that our sins furnished the occasion of his death, and that he died to abolish them, not that he suffered the punishment due to them. They suppose that he is said to "sanc-"tify the people with his own blood, shed for the "remission of sins," 'inasmuch as,' to use the language of Crellius,* 'by means of his bloody death 'he has penetrated into the highest heavens, and by 'his care delivers us from the guilt and punishment 'of sins.' By his having "given himself a ransom," and "his life a ransom "for many," they understand, not that he suffered any vicarious punishment, but that from the sacrifice of his life, *we* derive an example of piety, a thing necessary to salvation; and *he* acquires the right and power to deliver us from the servitude of sins and the punishments due to them. And finally, the followers of Socinus are far from acknowledging that Jesus Christ our advocate really executes the office of an advocate, being of opinion that he is called "an advocate," and said to "make "intercession," not as commending us and our services to God, but because by power received from God he preserves us, if we go to him, secure from sin and from punishment. Thus the disciples of Socinus, whenever they are pressed with passages of scripture, betake themselves to verbal ambiguities or metaphorical senses, as to impregnable fortresses. In the course of my studies on these subjects, indeed, I have sometimes observed such subterfuges altogether precluded to them by the very tenour and scope of the places which treat of the sacrifice of Christ. Yet it

* In Heb. xiii. 12.

has appeared to me worthy of consideration, whether it would not be possible from the nature of the facts themselves, the death and sacrifice of Jesus, to elicit and establish a little more certain sense of all those phrases by which the efficacy and design of those facts is expressed in the scriptures; concluding, that, if this could be accomplished, the facts themselves would invariably throw more light on the expressions, than the expressions on the facts.

While I was reflecting on these things, it occurred to me that the scriptures speak of Christ as our high priest, and of his death not only as the death of a martyr and witness, but also as that of an expiatory victim, slain for the sins of mankind; that the high priest of the Jews shadowed forth Jesus Christ our high priest, and their expiatory victims, to say nothing here of the others, represented Christ as our victim; and lastly, that it is beyond all doubt, that what was shadowed forth by the types was really accomplished by the antitype. Being fully persuaded of this sentiment, I thought it necessary to examine the sacrifices of the Jews, and carefully to inquire,—what is the proper design of a sacrifice;—what kinds of sacrifices were appointed by the laws of Moses;—which of those kinds principally shadowed forth the sacrifice of Christ;—what a very particular selection of every kind was appointed by God;—to what persons each kind was either enjoined or permitted;—on what accounts, with what ceremonies, and in what place, it was to be offered and killed;—what was the design of the sacred tabernacle, of the temple at Jerusalem, of the consecrated altar, and of the sacred

table;—what were the respective parts of the priests, the Levites, and the offerers, in regard to the sacrifices;—and lastly, what opinions were held by the Jewish doctors, and by the Heathens, on their respective sacrifices; and by the ancient Christian writers on both.

My examination of these and many other points led me to form two conclusions respecting the sacrifices of the Jews. First, That the efficacy of them all, like that of solemn prayers and thanksgivings, properly had respect to God; because I found them all to have been divinely instituted, as means of obtaining or celebrating his favour. Secondly, That the expiatory victims, by their vicarious suffering, expiated the sins of those persons for whom they were offered.—These two positions I thought required to be distinctly proved, before I should treat of the Sacrifice of Christ; lest by crowding the Jewish sacrifices, and the ceremonies belonging to them, into the same part of the work with topics peculiar to Christianity, I should induce obscurity on the subjects of my discussion and be tedious to the readers. And conceiving that all the Jewish sacrifices might be examined with nearly the same labour as these two propositions, I thought it better to discuss the whole of the subject at large, than to confine myself to certain parts of it, and those disconnected with each other. Such was the occasion of my writing the following dissertation on the Sacrifices of the Jews, with the addition, where I thought it important, of some accounts of the sacrifices of other nations. I hope the work will be useful to persons who are

desirous of knowing, what it concerns all to be well acquainted with, the design and efficacy of the Sacrifice of Christ.

DISSERTATION I.

ON ALL THE

SACRIFICES OF THE JEWS,

WITH REMARKS ON

SOME OF THOSE OF THE HEATHENS.

CHAPTER I.

Opinions and Arguments on the Origin of Sacrifices.

THE sacred scriptures abound with passages in celebration of all the perfections of God, and especially of his *Holiness.* But this word is not always used in the same sense. Sometimes it denotes his perfect purity,* or constant and immutable choice of things consistent with rectitude, which is the meaning of St. Peter; "As he which hath called you is holy, so be "ye holy in all manner of conversation:"†—and sometimes it signifies that majesty which is discovered in every perfection; as in his infinite wisdom, uncontrollable power, and supreme and universal dominion: —attributes which entitle him to every kind of praise, and every species of worship. Thus *holy* is often equivalent to *great, awful, venerable.* This is the kind of holiness attributed to God by the sacred writers, whenever they call him "The Holy One of "Israel," or declare that "his name is holy." For *The Holy One of Israel* designates that venerable deity who was to be the sole object of Israelitish worship;

* I John iii. 3. † I Pet. i. 15.

and the name of God is called *holy*, as deserving of being invoked with the highest reverence. This is taught in that passage of David,—" Let them praise " thy great and terrible name; for it is holy;"*—where *holy* signifies worthy of veneration and praise.

II. From this twofold holiness attributed to God, arise two kinds of holiness belonging to some other beings. One of these is peculiar to beings endued with reason: such is the holiness of those who conform their lives and wills to the will of God. The other belongs to all those things which are separated from profane or common uses, and devoted to the purposes of religion. For the inviolable majesty of the creator, preserver, and governor of the universe, communicates a character of holiness, not only to *persons*, but also to *things* and *times* and *places*, and even to *rites* or *ceremonies*, particularly appropriated to God or his worship.

Among things possessing this kind of holiness, were anciently included sacrifices. This word is of Latin origin, and in that language, as far as I remember, generally signifies those rites by which any thing was consecrated and offered to the Deity: yet, for want of another term to designate the oblations made, both of animals and of things inanimate, I am often obliged to use it, to denote also the things themselves about which those rites were employed. In this, however, I follow the example of Isidore, who says: 'There are two kinds of offerings, a 'gift and a sacrifice. Whatever is procured by silver 'or gold, or by any other purchase is called a gift. 'A victim, and whatever is burnt or laid upon an 'altar, is a sacrifice.'†

* Psal. xcix. 3. † De Origin. Lib. VI. Cap. 19.

III. The first question that ought, if it were possible, to be determined by any one entering on the subject of sacrifices, is—whether they originally began to be offered in consequence of an express command of God, or merely from human choice. But this point being involved in great obscurity and difficulty, I think it will be better to state the arguments generally urged, or capable of being urged, on both sides, than to affirm any thing as certain respecting it.

Some are of opinion, that sacrifices were first offered in obedience to the command of God himself. Nor is their persuasion at all shaken by the silence of Moses in his writings, respecting any such command. For, as he never attributes the origin of sacrifices to a divine precept, so neither does he ascribe it to the choice of the persons who offered them; but leaves the matter wholly undetermined. Nor is this omission, say they, at all to be wondered at; since there must have been many and great events, of which the extreme brevity adopted by him has admitted no mention to be made in his history. The prophecy of Enoch, the severe troubles of Lot, caused by the abominations of Sodom, the pious admonitions of Noah,* though noticed by other writers, are nowhere recorded by him. Nor, which is much more to the present purpose, has he mentioned the oblations of Cain and Abel with a view to state every thing relating to sacrifices, but only to represent them as giving occasion to Cain's hatred and murder of his brother: so that as he has merely touched on them in passing, there is the less reason to wonder at his total silence respecting their origin.

The advocates of this sentiment are accustomed to

* Jude xiv. II Pet. ii. 5. 7, 8.

urge, in the first place, that it never could have entered into the mind of a wise and holy man, like Abel, either that the slaughter of innocent animals and the smell of carcasses and entrails would be acceptable to God; or even that these services would evince the supreme reverence of his heart towards God, and his profound veneration of the divine sovereignty over life and death, unless God himself had instituted such rites by an express command: especially since (as they conceive) nothing was originally offered in sacrifice, except what was used for human sustenance, but the use of animal food most probably was not allowed before the deluge.* Nor is this the

* The force of this argument constrained Grotius, a defender of the contrary opinion, to maintain that Abel's sacrifice consisted, not of the members of slaughtered animals, but only of the *milk* and best *fleeces* of living ones. So he interprets the original words in Genesis iv. 4. Whether he has any followers in this sentiment, I know not.

TR.—This notion of Grotius was adopted by Le Clerc, but has justly been rejected by commentators in general, as altogether fanciful and absurd. Though חלב is properly rendered *milk* in various passages of scripture, it cannot be shown to have that sense in any place which describes it as offered, or commanded to be offered, in sacrifice; and the use of the word in several other places justifies its being here translated *the fattest.* (Numb. xviii. 12. Psal. lxxxi. 16. cxlvii. 14.) Grotius asserts בכרות to mean *the best of the kind:* but, though it is admitted that Abel's oblation was of the best of his flock, this idea is conveyed in the word חלב; and no valid reason has been assigned for understanding בכרות any otherwise than in its literal and radical sense of *earliest* or *first born.* Of *wool,* there is no pretence for saying, that the text makes any mention at all; and that Abel's "bringing *of* his flock" implies his "bringing" *the wool* "of his flock," is a mere conjecture without any foundation. As Cain's "bringing *of* the fruit of "the ground," confessedly means his "bringing" some "of the fruit of the ground;" so Abel's "bringing *of* the firstlings "of his flock," evidently signifies his "bringing" some "of the firstlings "of his flock." (Pooli Synops. in loc. Heideg. Exerc. v. s. 20. Kennicott's Two Dissert. p. 192—194. edit. 1747.) The version of this text may be further improved in simplicity and clearness by rendering the conjunctive ו *even,* instead of *and.* "And Abel, he also brought (some) of "the firstlings of his flock, even of the fattest of them."

only argument of those who believe the first sacrifices to have been commanded by God: they adduce to the same purpose the assertion of an apostle, that "by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent "sacrifice than Cain:"* and nothing, they say, is done "by faith," but what is done by the direction of God himself.

IV. But there are others, who, so far from thinking that the faith of Abel here commended had its foundation in any express command of God, consider this passage as rather authorizing a contrary conclusion. For, if Abel offered sacrifices in obedience to a divine precept, what opinion must be formed respecting Cain? If his sacrifice was caused by the belief that God had given such a command, he evidently possessed the same faith as Abel himself: whereas the contrary appears to have been the fact. But, if he entertained no such belief, and without any express command of God, but from the dictates of his own mind, spontaneously sacrificed some of the gifts with which providence had favoured him;—if such was the conduct of Cain, a wicked man, influenced by the light of nature, how much more probably may Abel, a good man, be supposed to have done the same! These persons perceive but little force in the argument, that, without divine direction, Abel could never have supposed it would be acceptable to God for him to celebrate his power and goodness by religious rites and services involving the effusion of animal blood. Habituated as we have been to other customs and different modes of worship, we ought not, they say, at such a vast distance of time, hastily to decide what might possibly occur to the mind of Abel, especially

* Heb. xi. 4.

in things not contrary to the laws of nature, which sacrifices certainly are not; since God, who has never commanded any thing contrary to the laws of nature, enjoined them on the people of Israel. Nor do they think it at all surprising, if the first men took particular care that the sacrifices which they offered to God should be consumed by fire, unless perhaps they were consumed by fire descending from heaven: their entire consumption being necessary to prevent any part of what was consecrated to God from being transferred to profane uses; a circumstance which might have occurred, unless the oblations had invariably been committed to the flames. But however this may have been, they consider it as an act of presumption in any persons, to pronounce that sacrifices originated in a divine command, which is never mentioned in the scriptures; it being altogether incredible that such a law, if any such had been given by God to our first parents and their immediate descendants, should have been intentionally passed over in silence by all the sacred writers, as a fact of no importance.

But how do the advocates of this opinion account for the high commendation of Abel's faith? They say, that his supreme veneration for the former of all things, and for his dominion, power, and goodness, led him to conclude, that the best of all his flocks ought to be solemnly offered, as an expression of reverence and gratitude to his Creator, the giver of all and the sovereign of life and death; but that Cain being destitute of these pious sentiments, the fruits which he offered were neither the best of his crops nor acceptable to God.

V. Persons who view the subject in this light, there-

fore, are convinced that the primitive sacrifices were not occasioned by an express command of God, but by the dictates of natural reason. They believe that the first men were taught by the light of nature to discover that public worship and honour ought to be paid to God, and that this might be best effected if every individual made a solemn consecration to him of the best of his possessions. This notion, they think, derives considerable support from that passage of Moses: "And in the end of days* it came to "pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground "an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also "brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat "thereof."† For they understand "the end of days" to mean, with respect to Cain, the completion of his harvest, and, with respect to Abel, the time when his wealth was increased by the multiplication of his flocks; so that each of them at these seasons, taught by his own reason (for no law is produced) considered it his duty to offer to God some portion of the gifts received from him; but that one neither offered the best of his possessions, nor exercised sufficient gratitude of heart, whereas the other did both. To this purpose may be cited the language in which God censures the Israelites for an excessive confidence in sacrifices. "Put your burnt offerings unto "your "sacrifices, and eat flesh;" that is, 'Eat if you please, 'not only your peace offerings,' which are intended by the word here rendered *sacrifices*, 'but also your 'entire victims;' which nevertheless was forbidden by the law. "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor "commanded them, in the day that I brought them "out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings

* מקץ ימים. † Gen. iv. 3, 4.

"or sacrifices."* For how could the declaration here made by God to the Israelites, that when he brought their forefathers out of Egypt he gave them no immediate command respecting sacrifices,—how could this diminish their excessive estimation of those rites, if he had enjoined on mankind the very same species of worship and similar sacrificial rites from the earliest ages? Who will imagine that the laws given to Adam and his immediate descendants from the beginning of the world, are to be considered as less important than those which were afterwards given to the Hebrews on their departure from Egypt? So that there could be no reason why sacrifices should be said to have been commanded at a subsequent period, as being evidently things of very little importance; if they had been already appointed from the commencement of time.

VI. These and similar considerations, therefore, led most of the ancient fathers to conclude that sacrifices originated, not from any divine command, but from natural reason. Thus the author of the *Answers to the Orthodox*:† 'None of those who offered animals 'in sacrifice before the law, did it by any divine pre-'cept; though God appears to have accepted the 'sacrifice; his acceptance of the offering being a proof 'of his acceptance of the person who offered it.' And again: 'God nowhere appears to have given 'any law to Noah for the sacrificing of animals.' On this passage of Moses, "And in the end of days "it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of "the ground an offering unto the Lord," Chrysostom makes the following observations. 'See how the 'author of nature endued the conscience with know-

* Jer. vii. 21, 22. † Resp. ad. Quæst. 83.

'ledge. For who, I ask, led him to such a conside-
'ration? No other than his own conscious intelli-
'gence. He brought, it is said, of the fruit of the
'ground an offering unto the Lord; for he saw and
'was persuaded that it behoved him to offer some of
'his property to God, as the lord of all his posses-
'sions; not in consequence of any necessity in the
'Divine Being; but to testify the gratitude of his
'heart for the enjoyment of such beneficence.' And
a little after, speaking of Abel as well as Cain:
'Nor had he any teacher, monitor, or counsellor;
'but each of them was excited to this oblation by the
'teaching of his own conscience, and the wisdom
'given from above to mankind.' Addressing the
people of Antioch, he says of Abel: 'Without hav-
'ing been instructed by any one, or received any law
'respecting the first fruits, but of his own accord and
'taught by his own conscience, he brought that sacri-
'fice.'* To the authors already cited may be added
Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Theodoret, Cyril
of Alexandria, and some other ancient writers; who
believed the Jewish sacrifices to have been instituted,†
because the people, having been long accustomed to
such modes of worship in Egypt, could scarcely have
been confined to the worship of the one true God,
without the indulgence, and introduction into their
religion, of those rites to which they had been long
habituated and were exceedingly attached. This cause
for those rites would never have gained the appro-
bation of such eminent men, if they had apprehended
the same forms of religion to have been instituted by
God at the beginning of the world. Nor could it

* Homil. 12. † Spenceri Dissert. de Urim et Thummim, c. 4. s. 7.
TR.—Vide etiam Suiceri Thesaur, tom. 1. p. 1418, 1419.

escape their observation, that if God had any reason for originally enjoining sacrifices on the parents of mankind, the same reason, without any regard to customs long practised by the Egyptians, might have caused his injunction of the same rites on the Hebrews at their departure from Egypt.

The same opinion respecting the origin of sacrifices appears to have been held by Maimonides, as we shall soon see; and also by Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson, as his language sufficiently shews: 'Cain 'and Abel, as we have said, were very wise men; 'and so it came to pass, that when they had arrived 'at the proposed end of their labours, each brought 'from his possessions an offering to God. The rea-'son of this oblation appears to me to have been, 'because they knew that all things which come into 'existence are under the administration of God, to 'whom be praise, and that God is their true cause; 'or perhaps they brought offerings of those things, 'because they understood that all things were cer-'tainly created by him.'* They are followed by Rabbi Isaac Abarbinel: 'Adam and his sons offered sacri-'fices, because they considered themselves as thereby 'worshipping God.'† With these, among more modern writers, agrees the very learned Grotius, who is of opinion,‡ that Cain and Abel offered sacrifices, 'not by any divine command, but from the dictates 'of reason, that public honour ought to be rendered 'to God, and that the best way of doing this was 'by presenting to him those things which are most 'valuable to men.'

Eusebius of Cæsarea, from his observations on the sacrifices offered by Abel, Noah, Abraham, and

* In Genes. iv. † In Præfat ad Levitic. ‡ In Genes. iv. 3.

every man of eminent piety in those times, is supposed to have held a different opinion from his contemporaries respecting their origin. 'The design of 'this I apprehend, not to have been fortuitous, or of 'human origin, but to have been suggested by a 'divine judgment. For as pious perons, who were 'familiar with God and had their minds enlightened 'by the divine spirit, saw that they needed a great 'remedy for the expiation of deadly sins, they con-'cluded that a ransom for their salvation ought to be 'presented to God, the disposer of life and death. 'And having nothing to consecrate to him, more ex-'cellent or valuable than their own lives, they offered 'the brutes in their stead, sacrificing other lives in 'the room of their own.' From this passage it is confidently inferred by some, that Eusebius believed the first sacrifices to have been offered at the command of God. But the passage by no means warrants such a conclusion. For he has no reference here to sacrifices of inanimate objects, having before observed, that such oblations were of little avail: and the animals sacrificed by Abel, Noah, and Abraham, he represents as immolated not in obedience to any express command of God; but in compliance with the dictates of a divine reason, which was not common to every man, but peculiar to all persons of eminent piety. And to comprize all in few words, it was the opinion of Eusebius, that Cain sacrificed inanimate things wholly from his own natural inclination, but that all pious men, as Abel, Noah, and Abraham, taught by a kind of divine reasoning, as we have already stated, sacrificed animals.

These are the different opinions respecting the rise of sacrifices; a subject on which, for my own part, I

would rather be altogether silent, than affirm any thing as certain.* But before I proceed, it is proper

* TR.—Though the author professes, as he doubtless intended, to lay before his readers an impartial statement of opinions and arguments on both sides; the fuller detail and distinguished names brought forward in favour of the notion that sacrifices originated in human invention, are calculated to give to that hypothesis a preponderance to which it is by no means entitled. The assumptions by which its ablest advocates have endeavoured to account for the supposed invention, afford no satisfactory solution of the difficulties with which it is embarrassed.

The first sacrifices are pretended to have been gifts presented by men to God, as demonstrations of gratitude, expressions of penitence, or means of conciliating favour. But that by any conceivable appropriation or disposal of animals or vegetables, those animals or vegetables should be considered as *given* to *an invisible and spiritual being*, without some previous appointment associating the ideas and establishing a connection between the act and purpose, is a conjecture which derives no probability from experience, an imaginary case to which the history of man furnishes no parallel. The absurdity of supposing such an association of actions and ideas, independent of some previous appointment by which they were connected, renders it also equally improbable that such an appointment should have been the mere creature of human device. The want of connection founded in nature or discoverable by reason, between any action performed upon animals or vegetables and the idea of a gift to an invisible and spiritual being, is a consideration which I do not remember to have seen introduced into any discussion of this subject; but it appears to me sufficient, of itself, to invalidate the hypothesis of human invention, and to evince its entire incredibility. Perhaps it was this consideration which led Dr. Priestley, at one period, to regard sacrifices as arising from anthropomorphitical notions of God; but finding, it would seem, no ground for imputing such notions to Cain and Abel, and being unable to account for the commencement of such rites upon any principles of nature or reason, he afterwards declared his opinion in favour of their divine origin. Speaking of the offerings of Cain and Abel, he says: 'On the whole it seems most 'probable that men were instructed by the Divine Being himself in this 'mode of worship.' *Notes on* Gen. iv. 3.

The improbability of sacrifices having sprung from human invention applies to sacrificial oblations of every kind; but presses with peculiar force on those which involve the destruction of animal life. That the Creator would be honoured or appeased by the slaughter of his creatures without his command or permission, is one of the most unnatural of all suppositions. It is evident from the language of scripture, that animal food formed no part of human sustenance till after the deluge, when, for the first time, God granted it to Noah and his posterity. *Genes.* i. 29, 30.

to remark, that those who believe sacrifices to have originated in the free choice of each individual, though

ix. 3. And if the slaughter of animals in sacrifice was not a divine institution, and killing them for food had not yet been permitted, what reason can be assigned for believing, that before the flood men had any more right to take away the lives of the brutes than of each other? Unacquainted with the true origin of a rite which had been practised from time immemorial, the more intelligent and philosophical heathens, Pythagoras, Plato, and others, wondered how an institution so dismal and abhorrent from the divine nature, as it appeared to them, could enter into the minds of men and diffuse itself through the world. *Kennicott's Two Diss.* p. 203. This difficulty, inexplicable as it is on the principles of reason, completely disappears in the light of revelation.

Neither the narrative of Moses, nor any other part of the scripture, countenances the ascription of sacrifice to human invention; and the general tenour of the inspired volume is altogether at variance with such a supposition. Though the dispensations of revealed religion have exhibited many varieties in successive periods, the principles of the divine administration appear to have been the same under different economies. The language of the gospel is in perfect harmony with the law and the prophets: "In vain do they worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments "of men." *Matt.* xv. 9. *Mark* vii. 7. *Isaiah* xxix. 13. And is it reasonable to believe, that "will-worship," which is altogether rejected by God under the New Testament, (*Coloss.* ii. 23.) was acceptable to him in the days of the patriarchs? But so it must have been, if sacrifice was a human invention. That, on the contrary, it was a divine institution, may well be inferred from the acceptance with which it was honoured. How this acceptance was testified in the case of Abel, is not recorded. It has been an ancient opinion, that his sacrifice was consumed by fire from heaven. Theodotion, a translator of the Old Testament into Greek, in the second century of the christian era, renders the latter part of Genesis iv. 4. "The Lord *burnt*, "or *consumed*, Abel's offering." (*Pooli Synops. in loc.*) But this, notwithstanding it obtained the approbation of Julian, must be acknowledged to be rather a paraphrase than a version. The acceptance, however, must have been testified in some way obvious to the senses: for the known reception of one oblation while the other was rejected is represented as the occasion of Cain's wrath which issued in the murder of his brother. (*Genes.* iv. 5—8.) And it is highly probable that Abel was favoured with the same miraculous token of approbation which often accompanied the sacrifices of the faithful in succeeding times. (*Levit.* ix. xxiv. *Judg.* vi. 21. I *Kings* xviii. 38. I *Chron.* xxi. 26. II *Chron.* vii. 1.) But whatever was the precise mode in which God evinced his "respect unto Abel "and to his offering," we may reasonably conclude it to have been supernatural; one whose meaning was well known from its having been previ-

they may appear to express themselves in some places without due caution, yet refer the custom of sacrificing,

ously employed on similar occasions; or which, if then exhibited for the first time, was attended with evidences of divinity, too striking to be overlooked, and too plain to be misunderstood. That a particular intervention of Deity should be vouchsafed, to crown a rite of human contrivance, is a notion not authorized by any analogous procedure in all the recorded communications of God with man.

We are not left, however, to form conclusions on this subject from mere probability or analogy. By the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, the superiority of the accepted oblation is ascribed to the faith of the offerer. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." *Hebrews* xi. 4. If Abel's faith was no more than a general belief of the existence and providence of the Creator and Governor of the universe, there can be no reasonable doubt that Cain was actuated by the same sentiment; or he would not have "brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto "the Lord:"—and faith, so explained, could not have conferred upon one any superiority over the other. But the *faith* celebrated in this chapter evidently appears to have been *a belief of divine declarations, followed by obedience to divine commands.* "By faith Noah, being warned of God of "things not seen as yet, prepared an ark:" he believed what God foretold, and built an ark according to his injunction. "By faith Abraham, when "he was called to go out into a place which he should afterwards receive "for an inheritance, obeyed:" he believed that God would put him in possession of the promised inheritance, and left his native country in obedience to the divine call. In conformity with the representation of faith in this chapter, it is expressly affirmed in another epistle, that "faith "cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." *Romans* x. 17. Faith, then, necessarily supposes a divine revelation. That Abel, "in "things pertaining to God," was guided by the discoveries of revelation, rather than the deductions of reason, is further evident from the apostle's assertion concerning *him* and others whom he had just named: "These "all died in faith not having received" (the fulfilment of) "the promises, "but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and em-"braced them." *Hebrews* xi. 13. Dr. Kennicott judiciously argues: 'Temporal promises relating to the land of Canaan are not entirely, if at 'all, meant here; for the apostle speaks of all the patriarchs whom he had 'mentioned in the beginning of this chapter: but of Abraham, one of the 'patriarchs mentioned, it is expressly said, that he "sojourned in the land 'of promise;" and as Abel, Enoch, and Noah, three of those included 'in the word ALL, had not received the promise of entering the land of 'Canaan, it must have been *some other* promise, made in the first ages, 'and frequently repeated, to which the apostle here alludes: and *what* 'promise can that be, but the promise of a future Redeemer, made to

not to the laws of nature, properly so called, which are indeed eternal and immutable; but to that class of

'Adam?' *Two Dissert.* p. 214, 215. Abel believed the divine word, and evinced his belief by practising that mode of worship which was appointed to typify the *promised seed*, and the benefits to be derived from *him*, who was one day to be known on earth as "the Lamb of God which taketh "away the sin of the world," and was afterwards to be glorified in heaven as "a Lamb that had been slain."

If these remarks are correct, they throw considerable light on the divine expostulation with Cain; which, with any other exposition that has been suggested, is scarcely intelligible. "Is there not, if thou doest well, ex-"altation, or pre-eminence, and, if thou doest not well, a sin-offering "lying at thy door?" *Pooli Synops. in loc.* In many other passages of scripture the word חטאה unquestionably signifies a sin-offering; and that it should be so rendered in this place, as proposed by Dr. Lightfoot, is most consitent with the grammatical construction of the sentence, as well as with the connection and obvious design of the address. *Dr. Magee's Discourses and Dissertations*, Vol. II. No. 65. God suggests to Cain the cause of the rejection of his offering, and directs him to the instituted mode of acceptable worship.

The arguments which tend to prove the sacrifice of Abel to have been offered in conformity to divine appointment, equally induce a belief that this rite must have been enjoined on our first parents immediately after their fall. Whence, also, the skins with which they were clothed? It is utterly improbable that any animals had died of themselves so soon after their creation; nor can it with plausibility be pretended that any had yet been slain for food. The only reasonable conclusion is that they were from animals slain in sacrifice. Connected with the institution of sacrifices, these coats of skins acquire an importance which may account for the mention of them by the sacred historian; though the brevity of the whole narrative may likewise account for his having said nothing further concerning them. That sacrificial rites had been practised antecedently to the recorded oblations of Cain and Abel, many learned men consider as placed above probability by the terms which describe the time when these offerings were brought: they contend that the phrase מקץ ימים, literally *the end of days*, must denote *a stated season* for the performance of a stated service. *Kennicott's Two Diss.* p. 177—183.

Some of these arguments might be further enforced, and others not unworthy of serious attention might be adduced in confirmation of the opinion here maintained; but this note having already extended to a great length, I shall only add one observation more.

The diversity in the oblations of Cain and Abel, and their different reception, have been finely illustrated by a comparison with the parable in which our Lord represents the different devotions of a pharisee and publi-

institutions which may have been devised by natural reason as adapted and suitable to the public worship of God. If any have referred it to the laws of nature, their error is easily proved from this fact, that the sacrificial rites practised by the ancients have been wholly abolished by Christ among his followers; though he was far from abolishing any of the laws of nature, but by his authority ratified, confirmed, and established them all.

VII. But though it does not clearly appear, whether the first sacrifices were offered in obedience to any certain command of God, or in compliance with the dictates of human reason, yet it is beyond all doubt, that, on the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt, God himself enjoined on them the rite of sacrificing, by a written law. His design in doing this is the next subject of inquiry.

On this topic Maimonides justly observes, that in the religious rites connected with sacrifices there was nothing intrinsically acceptable to God, nothing with which he was pleased for its own sake; and hence he concludes, that the law of sacrifices was not given by the first counsel of God, but proceeded from the second.* This is clearly suggested in the following passages, as Maimonides himself also perceived.

can, and their different success. Abel who by sacrificing an animal acknowledged his true character as a sinner, and evinced his faith and hope in the divine mercy by the appointed way of seeking forgiveness,—was accepted: while Cain who contented himself with a eucharistic offering, acknowledging his obligations as a creature, but regardless of his condition as a sinner, and neglecting the instituted means of seeking the divine mercy,—was rejected. So the publican, with his confession of guilt and supplication for pardon, "went down to his house justified, rather than "the" pharisee, with his fastings and tythes and thanksgivings. *Cloppenburg Sacrif. Patriarch. Schol. apud Shuckford*, Vol. I. p. 87, 88. Edit. 1731.

* Moreh Nevoch. par. 3. c. 32.

"Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings "and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the "Lord?* To what purpose is the multitude of your "sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of "the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed "beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, "or of lambs, or of he-goats.† I spake not unto "your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that "I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concern-"ing burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing com-"manded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will "be your God, and ye shall be my people."‡ The following passage also is to the same purpose. "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow "myself before the high God? Shall I come before "him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, "or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give "my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my "body for the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, "O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord "require of thee, but to do justly, and to love "mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"§ From these scriptures it is fairly concluded, that those things which pertain to the immutable law of nature, rest on a very different foundation from sacrifices; that the former are of themselves acceptable to God, but that the latter, unconnected with the former, afford him no pleasure at all.

VIII. But though these things are sufficiently evident, it was not for trivial reasons that God enjoined on the Hebrew nation, a religion which consisted in a great measure in the offering of sacrifices. The ancient

* I Sam. xv. 22. † Isai. i. 11. ‡ Jerem. vii. 22, 23. § Mic. vi. 6, 7, 8.

Christians, indeed, were of opinion, that the cause of this appointment was the deep root which this kind of religion had taken among that people before their departure from Egypt. With this rite the sons of Adam, Noah, and Abraham himself, who was always held in high estimation by his posterity, had worshipped God, as is sufficiently manifest. But it prevailed most of all in succeeding times in Egypt, where the Hebrews dwelt for a long series of years. Hence the fathers concluded, that the attachment of the Hebrews to sacrifices was such as could neither be safely prohibited, nor, amidst the daily growth of superstition, be left to the choice of every individual. It could not well be prohibited, they say, especially among the Hebrews who were so excessively addicted to sacrifices; the practice having grown so inveterate, that there seems not the least reason to doubt but they would have offered sacrifices to false gods, if they had not been permitted to offer them to the true God. Nor, on the other hand, would it have been proper to leave to individual choice a religion which, if not defined and circumscribed by the laws of God himself, might easily slide into barbarous and strange customs, and gradually draw a superstitious people into a strange worship. And this is supposed to have been the reason why God transferred the rite of sacrificing to his own worship; being a rite of such a nature as could not be advantageously, either abolished, or practised in a variety of ways according to individual caprice.

But it must be particularly observed, that the things which the heathens connected with their sacrifices were not all introduced into the worship of God with the sacrifices themselves: neither the kinds of ani-

mals, nor the sacrificial rites, were all the same in the religion of the Israelites as in that of other nations. God made a great selection, both of things and of rites, for his sacrifices. Thus he indulged in some measure the disposition of the people, and opposed the corrupt inclinations which would carry them away into strange superstitions.

IX. These are considered, by ancient as well as modern writers, as the reasons which induced God to enjoin the rite of sacrificing upon a people unacquainted with heavenly things. Thus Justin Martyr: 'Accommodating himself to that people, 'God commanded them to offer sacrifices to his 'name, that they might not fall into idolatry.'*—Tertullian: 'Let no one censure the burdens of 'sacrifices, and the troublesome niceties of operations 'and oblations, as though God really required such 'things for himself, who so explicitly expostulates, '"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacri-'fices unto me? Who hath required this at your 'hands?". 'But let us observe the constant care of 'God by which he designed to attach to his religion 'a people prone to idolatry and transgression by 'ceremonies similar to those practised in the super-'stition of the age; to call them away from it, by 'commanding those ceremonies to be performed to 'himself as if necessary to him, lest they should fall 'into idolatry.'†—Origen: 'God, as he says by ano-'ther prophet, "eats not the flesh of bulls, nor drinks 'the blood of goats." And as it is written in another 'place—"I commanded thee not concerning sacrifices 'or burnt offerings in the day that I brought thee out 'of the land of Egypt." But Moses enjoined these

* Contra Tryphon. † Adv. Marcion. Lib. 2. cap. 18.

'things upon them for the hardness of their hearts, and 'in consideration of the very evil customs to which 'they had been habituated in Egypt, that as they could 'not refrain from offering sacrifices, they might offer 'them to God, and not to demons.'*—And Chrysostom: 'Think it not unworthy of God that the Magi 'were called by a star: thus you would dishonour every 'thing among the Jews, the sacrifices, the purifica-'tions, the new moons, the ark, and the temple 'itself; for all these things derived their origin from 'heathen stupidity. But in order to save those who 'were going astray, God suffered himself to be 'worshipped by these things with which other na-'tions worshipped demons; correcting them a little, 'that by gradually withdrawing the people from their 'former custom he might conduct them to superior 'wisdom.'† The same opinion was maintained, as Spencer has observed,‡ by Cyril of Alexandria, by Jerome, by Isidore of Pelusium, and other ancient writers. They are followed, among other moderns, by the very learned Grotius. He says: 'As the 'ends of sacrifices were various, which you may find 'in Arnobius and Jamblichus, and partly in Macro-'bius, so also were the rites connected with them; 'which were either derived from the Hebrews by 'other nations, or, which is more probable, being 'used by the Syrians and Egyptians, were corrected 'by the Hebrews, and adopted by other nations 'without that correction."§

Nor have these sentiments been held by Christians only, but also by some Jews. They are maintained in the following passage of Maimonides. 'It was

* Homil. 2. in Numer. † Homil. 6. in Matth.
‡ Dissert. de Ur. et Thum. c. 4. s. 7. § In Levit. i.

'the custom practised in those times all over the 'world, and the religion common to all nations, for 'various kinds of animals to be sacrificed in the 'temples in which images were placed, and for all 'persons to prostrate themselves and burn incense 'to those images. There were also certain ministers 'devoted and appointed to the worship which was 'celebrated in the temples erected in honour of the 'sun, the moon, and the stars: which things we 'have treated of before. Wherefore the divine wis-'dom and providence, which is displayed in all 'created things, would not command the total dis-'continuance and abolition of all those forms of re-'ligion; because the nature of man, ever prone to 'that to which it has been accustomed, would have 'revolted at such an injunction. And indeed this 'would have been just such a precept as if any pro-'phet, professing a concern for the honour of God, 'were to come to us in the present age with the fol-'lowing address: God warns you not to pray, or to 'fast, or to implore his aid in times of affliction; 'but that your religion must be wholly confined to 'the thoughts of your minds, and not be discovered 'in your actions.—On this account, therefore, God 'retained the forms of religion which had been pre-'viously used, and transferring them, from created 'objects and fictitious things destitute of all reality, 'to his own venerable name, commanded us to per-'form them to himself.'* Maimonides is followed by Rabbi Shem Tob in his commentaries on this passage, and likewise by a man deeply versed in Jewish learning, Isaac Abarbinel; who, after having defended the opinion of Maimonides against Nach-

* Mor. Nev. par. 3. c. 32.

manides, concludes the discussion in the following manner. 'You see, therefore, that the opinion of 'Maimonides has a very solid foundation in the law, 'and in the prophets, and in the hagiographa, and in 'all the sayings of the rabbies that are either recol-'lected or recorded; and that his language on this 'subject is not vain, but consistent with piety.'*

X. But whatever credit is due to these considerations, which so many learned men have esteemed the causes of the ancient rite of sacrificing being transferred into the Mosaic covenant;† it is beyond all

* In Præfat. ad Levit.

† TR. — The reasoning employed in a preceding note, against the supposition that sacrifices were originally of human invention, will also serve to expose the unreasonableness of considering the Hebrew ritual as an imitation of forms and ceremonies practised in Egypt, or a condescension to habits and prejudices contracted by the Israelites in that country. There can be no need of resorting to Egyptian ingenuity for the archetypes of rites enjoined by Moses. That a notion so degrading to his system, and so dishonourable to the authority by which he acted, could ever be adopted by any believer in the divine legation of the Jewish lawgiver, is truly astonishing. A notion so improbable in itself requires the most positive and unequivocal evidence to justify its admission. But of such evidence it is entirely destitute. Its most learned advocate, it was long ago observed by the learned Shuckford, 'is able to produce no one ceremony or usage, 'practised both in the religion of Abraham or Moses, and in that of the 'heathen nations, but that it may be proved that it was used by Abraham 'or Moses, or by some of the worshippers of the true God, earlier than by 'any of the heathen nations.' *Connect.* vol. I. p. 317. And that the Divine Author of the Jewish code imitated the customs of idolaters who had imitated and corrupted the true religion of the patriarchs, is a proposition the mere statement of which seems sufficient to ensure its rejection. But the adoption of this hypothesis by any who admit the divine authority of the New Testament as well as the Old, is still more extraordinary. The New Testament represents the law as preparatory to the gospel, and the rites of Judaism as typical of Christianity. Hence it will follow, that if the law of Moses was a compliance with heathen notions and customs, the gospel of Jesus Christ must be the same. This inference is unavoidable. Nor is it a consequence merely charged upon the hypothesis by its opponents, and acknowledged by none of its advocates. Archbishop Tillotson expressly avows it: 'With these notions' (of sacrificial atonement) 'God was

doubt that the particular design of God in instituting the Mosaic sacrifices, was, by those sacrifices, to shadow forth the great Sacrifice of Christ.

Hence the apostle to the Hebrews, comparing the Jewish sacrifices with the sacrifice of Christ, says, "the law had a shadow," that is a type, "of good "things to come." Hence he compares the holy of holies in the tabernacle with the highest heaven, the high priest of the Jews with Jesus Christ our high priest, and their sacrifices, especially those offered on the day of expiation, with the great sacrifice of Christ, as shadowy types with antitypes, as earthly things with those which are heavenly. And hence some particular rites were appointed in relation to the principal victims, in order to represent some principal circumstances in the sacrifice of Christ. Because Christ was to be put to death without the walls of Jerusalem, of which the camp of the people was an emblem; it was therefore directed that the principal sacrifices of the Jews should be burned without the

'pleased to comply so far, as, in the frame of the Jewish religion, to ap-'point sacrifices to be slain and offered up for the sinner.—A great part of 'the Jewish religion and worship was a plain condescension to the general 'apprehensions of men concerning this way of appeasing the deity by 'sacrifice: and the greatest part of the pagan religion and worship was 'likewise founded upon the same notion.—And with this general notion 'of mankind, whatever the ground or foundation of it might be, God was 'pleased so far to comply, as once for all to have a general atonement 'made for the sins of all mankind, by the sacrifice of his only Son.' But that the system of the gospel, in which Jehovah is declared to have "abounded in all wisdom and prudence," which is described as an object of eternal decrees and the consummation of preceding economies, which is represented as exciting the curiosity of angelic minds and affording them new discoveries of "the manifold wisdom of God;"—that this system was framed in compliance with the notions of erring heathens, who had "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the "creature more than the Creator,"—is a notion equally repugnant to reason and dishonourable to revelation."

camp: and because Christ, who is both high priest and sacrifice, was not to enter into heaven without his own blood having been first shed, hence it was provided that the Jewish high priest should not enter into the holy of holies without the blood of the sacrifices. But these things are to be discussed more at large in subsequent parts of this work. In prosecuting the other branches of the subject, we are to treat,—first, of the places appropriated to sacrifices; —secondly, of the ministers of sacrifices;—and lastly, of the sacrifices themselves, and the rites performed upon them. When these points shall have been discussed, it will be easy to demonstrate what was the proper efficacy and design of sacrifices.

CHAPTER II.

The Places used for offering Sacrifices.

THE places in which sacrifices might be lawfully offered present three principal subjects for examination: first, the places themselves; secondly, the sanctuaries, courts, altars, rooms, and other parts which they contained; thirdly, their nature and design.

Before the tabernacle was erected at the immediate command of God, it was lawful to perform religious ceremonies in any place, and consequently in those little shrines which, from their being built in elevated situations, are generally called "high places."* After the erection of the tabernacle this was forbidden to the Jews. For as long as that tabernacle, the depository of the ark, stood in the midst of the congregation, which was the case in the wilderness, or was fixed in any other more permanent situation, all victims were to be brought thither, and there they were to be sacrificed in the manner prescribed.† To this purpose are the following observations of Jewish writers. 'While the people were in the wilderness, 'it was provided by the law, that no one should offer 'sacrifices in the high places; but this law ceased 'when they came to Gilgal, where, as there was no 'fixed or certain situation for the tabernacle, the 'people were separated into various places. But on 'the building of the sanctuary at Shiloh, which was 'reared with stone walls though it was covered with 'curtains, the same law that had been in force in the 'wilderness became binding again. For in this 'place the ark had a fixed and certain station.

* Levit. xxvi. 30. † Levit. xvii. 4, 5, 6.

'Hence that sanctuary is frequently called "the 'house of God."* When the ark was at Nob and 'Gibeon, where it had no fixed station, it was law-'ful again to perform divine worship in the high 'places. Hence in those times Samuel offered sacri-'fices in some such place.† This was never per-'mitted to the Israelites after the building of the 'temple at Jerusalem, where the ark had a fixed and 'permanent station.'‡ With the Jews coincides the learned Grotius, in his explanation of this prohibition of Moses, "Ye shall not do after all the things "that we do here this day."§ 'Ye shall not offer 'sacrifices in various places, but in one. That place 'was first Shiloh, and afterwards the temple at Jeru-'salem. In the intermediate periods this law was 'suspended, because the ark had no fixed station. 'For it was at Mizpeh, at Gilgal, at Nob, at Gibeon, 'and in the house of Obed-edom.' To the same purpose he also remarks:‖ 'At that time on account 'of the frequent removals, there was no fixed or 'certain place for sacrifices.'

II. As the sacred tabernacle, then, was the first place exclusively appointed for the oblation of sacrifices, and was afterwards succeeded by the temple at Jerusalem, I proceed to give some account of their sanctuaries, courts, and other parts already mentioned.

In the tabernacle, a full description of all the construction and furniture of which would be irrelevant to the present subject, there were two sanctuaries, divided by a suspended curtain: one is generally

* Judg. xviii. 31. I Sam. i. 24. † I Sam. ix. 12, 13.
‡ Schilte Hagibborim c. 57. Isaac Abarbinel and R. Levi Ben Gerson, on I Kings iii. § Deut. xii. 8. ‖ Comm. I Sam. ix. 12, 13.

called the inner, and the other the outer sanctuary. The former on account of its superior sanctity, being the peculiar residence of the symbolical presence of God, and emblematical of the highest heaven, is denominated "the holy of holies."* In it was placed the sacred ark, the cover of which is called "the "propitiatory" or "mercy-seat."† Above the mercy-seat, that nothing might be wanting to a similitude of the highest heaven, stood two cherubims, with their faces directed towards each other, and both looking towards the mercy-seat, which they also covered with their expanded wings. From this place God was accustomed to speak to Moses, and hence he delivered his holy oracles.‡

In the outer sanctuary was a table, always supplied with bread, which is commonly called "the shew "bread;" and an altar to burn incense upon, with four horns. The table and altar were both overlaid with gold: whence the altar is frequently called the golden altar. In this sanctuary was a candlestick constantly furnished with seven lamps; which many suppose to have represented the stars of heaven, as they imagine the place itself to have been a figure of the visible world. Nor is it improbable, that, as the inner sanctuary was an emblem of the supreme heaven, so the outer sanctuary was an image of the visible world; and that thus the residence which God had among the Hebrews shadowed forth his vast temple of the universe. Before the door of the tabernacle was a court inclosed on every side by extended cur-

* קדש קדשים

† The original כפרת is rendered by the Septuagint, sometimes ἐπίθεμα the *covering*, sometimes ἱλαστήριον the *propitiatory*.

‡ Exod. xxv. 22. Num. vii. 8, 9.

tains. *There* was placed a larger altar to burn the sacrifices upon, with a sloping ascent and four horns. This altar was covered, not with gold, but with brass. Between the altar and the door of the tabernacle stood a brazen laver, where the priests used to wash their hands and their feet when they were about to enter on any sacred services; for they were prohibited to perform any of the rites of their worship with their hands or feet unwashed.

It is not necessary to enumerate all the other parts and appendages of the tabernacle. It only requires to be added, that the tabernacle itself, and all its vessels, in order to give them the greater appearance of sanctity, were anointed with a holy oil; which was the way in which God directed them to be consecrated and dedicated to himself.

III. As a moveable sanctuary was sufficiently adapted to the unsettled state of the people in the wilderness, so it little comported with the fixed habitions, and ample wealth which they acquired on their settlement in Canaan. Influenced by this consideration, and expecting to illustrate his own name, David, the best of their kings, meditated the great work of erecting a fixed and splendid edifice as a temple for God. The piety of the design was commended, but the work itself was not permitted to be executed, as not becoming a man engaged in war and stained with blood and slaughter. That honour was reserved for Solomon, a monarch born to peace and tranquillity; who having ascended the throne, acquired immense wealth, and obtained the friendship of Hiram king of Tyre, which very much facilitated the great work, erected a magnificent temple to Jehovah.

The sanctuaries of the temple and tabernacle were

evidently the same. The furniture of the inner sanctuary was the same in both, but in the temple, that of the outer sanctuary was increased. To the candlestick made by Moses were added ten others, five on the right-hand and five on the left; and to the original table of shew bread, ten other tables; five on the right side, and five on the left. In the temple there were two courts, the court of the priests, and the court of the people; but whether the latter was divided by a wall, that the men and women might worship apart from each other, I have not been able to ascertain. In the court of the priests was placed the great altar, and the brazen laver, to which ten other lavers were added, beside the molten sea.* In these courts were constructed various rooms, all adapted to their respective uses; but what was the particular situation of each, the scriptures have not informed us.

IV. When the temple was rebuilt, it had the same courts, the same altars, and the same sanctity, as at its first erection. Nor is it any objection to this, that the consecrated ark, the celestial fire, the oracles given by urim and thummim, the shechinah or symbol of the divine majesty, and the spirit of prophecy, or, as others think, the holy anointing oil, which adorned the first temple, are said to have been wanting in the second. For whatever sanctity belonged to the temple at its first erection, belonged to it also after its restoration; because the place once consecrated retained its sanctity as long as the law of Moses continued in force: and this argument is strengthened by the consideration that the temple of Solomon was demolished, not by any command of God, but by the unjust violence of enemies. On this subject Mai-

* II Chron. iv. 2. 4. 7, 8, 9.

monides says: 'Whence proceeded the sanctity of 'the second temple? From that first consecration 'which was performed by Solomon. For he fixed 'the duration of the sanctity of the sanctuary and of 'Jerusalem. But he consecrated both for ever.'* With this connect what he adds just after: 'The 'sanctity of the sanctuary and of Jerusalem pro-'ceeds from the shechinah, but the shechinah never 'perishes.'

V. Of the temple after its re-erection, with its courts, rooms, and officers, some Jewish writers have given a particular description. And first, they state that adjoining to the porch of the temple was the court of the priests; next to the court of the priests, the court of the men; next to the court of the men, the court of the women; and next to the court of the women, an open space called the intermural, or a place between two walls. The temple itself, the court of the priests, and the court of the men, include the whole of the place which is commonly called the sanctuary.

As a considerable apparatus was necessary for a ritual worship, the nature of that worship required the construction of various apartments for the reception of various things. Thus in the four corners of the court of the women were inclosed four smaller courts.† The first was the court of the Nazarites; in which the Nazarites used to dress the peace offerings. The second was the receptacle of the oil; in which were deposited the wine and oil prepared for sacred uses. The third was the depository of the wood; in which the blemished priests separated the wormed wood: for wood that happened to be at all

* In Beth Habechira, c. 6. † Maimon. in Beth Habechira, c. 5.

worm-eaten was always rejected as unworthy to be fuel for the sacred fire. The fourth was the court of the lepers; in which persons used to be washed after having been cured of leprosy. In the court of the women also were the entrances to two rooms situated under the floor of the court of the men, which were appropriated to the reception of musical instruments.

Between the sanctuary and the intermural, or outer inclosure towards the north, was the *fire-house*,* which was divided into four apartments. Two of them, next the sanctuary, were holy on account of their situation: the other two, adjoining the outer inclosure, were common. The first was appropriated to the examination of the lambs destined for the daily sacrifices, lest there should be any blemish in them. The second was assigned to those who prepared the shew bread. In the third the Maccabees had deposited the stones of the altar profaned by Antiochus. The use of the fourth was twofold. For the priests kept guard in it, and from it was the entrance to a bath where they were to wash and purify themselves after the contraction of impurity. Near the bath was a fire, kept constantly burning, that after washing in the one they might immediately be dried and warmed by the other.

In the court of the men also there were eight rooms; three on the south, three on the north, and the other two near the eastern gate.† On the north (or, according to Maimonides,‡ on the south) was the room in which the salt prepared for salting the sacrifices was deposited; the room in which the skins of the victims were salted; and that in which the mem-

* Misna in Middoth, c. 1. † Misna in Middoth, c. 5.
‡ In Beth Habeeh. c. 5.

bers and entrails of the sacrifices used to be washed. On the opposite side was a room, of which the part next the sanctuary was holy, and the part next the outer inclosure was common; and in this part was the tribunal of the Sanhedrim: the well-room, in which was the fountain that supplied water for the use of the temple: and the wood-room, which, according to Maimonides,* was also the chamber of the high priest. Here the high priest used to be instructed in the sacred ceremonies which he was to perform on the day of expiation, lest he should fail in any of the solemnities of that day.

Near the eastern gate was the apartment of those who provided the daily cake for the high priests' meat offering; and the room appropriated to the use of those who had the charge of the pontifical vestments.

Over the gate of the sanctuary were two rooms.† In the former the holy incense used to be prepared, and in both the priests kept guard. For the priests used to watch in three places, in these two rooms and in the fire-house, and the Levites in one and twenty places, about the temple, every night. Maimonides supposes this to have been done, not so much for the protection of the temple, as for the honour of it.

In the sanctuary were two rooms; one, into which benevolent persons privately conveyed what they wished to be distributed to the poor; the other, into which persons brought all vessels which they presented for the use of the temple, but which, if unfit for the sacred service, were sold by the treasurers, and their value was expended in cleansing the temple.

* In Beth Habech. c. 5.

† Maimon. in Beth Habechira, c. 8. Misna in Middoth, c. 1.

VI. As there were many apartments in the temple, there were also many officers belonging to it.* The first of these convoked the priests, the Levites, and those who were called stationary men, with the following summons: 'Priests arise; Levites to the desk; 'Israelites to the station.' The stationary men were appointed to supply the places of the people at the sacrifices.† For as it was required that all persons for whom sacrifices were offered should be present at their respective oblations, but the whole nation could not be present at the sacrifices offered for all the people, hence it became a custom to select a number of the most eligible persons, who should attend at the public sacrifices as the representatives of the whole nation. These were called stationary men, and the business assigned them in relation to the sacrifices was called *the station*. A second was charged with the care of the gates. A third was the principal officer of the whole guard, and was called *the man of the mountain of the house*. A fourth presided over the singers. A fifth had the custody of the musical instruments. A sixth superintended the lots that determined the order in which every priest was to perform the sacred services. A seventh procured turtles and doves, which he sold to those who were about to make such offerings. An eighth was the keeper of the tickets on which certain words were inscribed, respectively indicating the appointed portion of wine and flour to be used with every victim. For a fixed price he delivered the ticket to the persons about to offer a sacrifice. A ninth, on receiving the ticket from them, supplied them with the portion of wine and flour expressed on the ticket. A tenth presided over the physicians in-

* Maimon. in Chel. Hammikdash, c. 7. † Ibid. c. 6.

trusted with the care of the priests; who, from walking without shoes on the pavement of the sanctuary, were frequently troubled with dysentery. An eleventh was inspector of the aqueducts of the city of Jerusalem, as well as of the sanctuary. A twelfth prepared the shew bread. A thirteenth compounded the holy incense. A fourteenth provided the curtains, and presided over those who wove them. The number of curtains belonging to the temple were thirteen; seven at the seven gates, one at the porch, one before the outer sanctuary, two before the inner sanctuary, and two in the upper part* of the temple. A fifteenth had the care of the sacred vestments of the temple. But what has been said may suffice on this part of the subject. We are now to shew what was the nature of the temple and the design of that sacred edifice. The reason for doing this will appear in another place.

* Called by the Hebrews עליה, and by the Greeks υπερωον. Misna in Middoth, c. 4, s. 5.

CHAPTER III.

The proper Nature and Design of the Tabernacle and Temple.

THE design of the tabernacle and temple was evidently one and the same. Both were equally sacred, and equally, in succession, the sanctuary of God. Not to involve a plain subject in any perplexities, we observe that each was designed to be a sacred mansion for the residence of God, as the king of the Hebrews, in the midst of his subjects. Between that edifice and the synagogues erected in succeeding times there was this important difference: in the synagogues God was merely worshipped, whereas in the temple he not only was worshipped, but resided in a remarkable manner, as we shall proceed to shew.

This is evident from the very command given for the construction of the tabernacle. For his language to Moses on this occasion was: "Let them make "me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them:"* which is the same as if he had said, 'I will dwell 'in that sanctuary which shall be in the midst of the 'camp of the people.' It was on this account that all unclean persons were to be removed out of the Israelitish camp; that they might not defile that camp in the midst of which God resided.† Nor was there any other reason why God is said to have "walked" in the midst of the camp,‡ than because he conspicuously resided in that tabernacle, which was carried about from place to place with the camp itself during the travels of the people in the wilderness.

* Exod. xxv. 8. † Num. v. 3. ‡ Deut. xxiii. 14. Levit. xxvi. 11, 12.

As the tabernacle was constructed, so the temple was built, for the express purpose of being the residence of God. Hence Solomon's address to God: "I "have surely built thee an house to dwell in, a settled "place to abide in forever."* To the same purpose is the song of Moses: "Thou shalt bring them in, "and plant them in the mountain of thine inherit-"ance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made "for thee to dwell in, in the sanctuary, O Lord, "which thy hands have established."† From these passages it may be concluded that the temple was designed to be a sacred habitation, chosen by God for his own residence in the midst of his people, and, as we are about to observe, illustrated by his special presence.

II. The same conclusion also follows from the sanctity of the temple so celebrated on all occasions; the only foundation of which was its possession of such a presence of God as was not common to it with other places, but was peculiarly its own. There is a twofold sanctity which is applicable to a place; the one circumstantial, the other local. If you consider it in a circumstantial view, a place is consecrated by a dedication to the worship of God; but a place, as a place, is consecrated by any remarkable presence of God, or symbol of his presence. For though there is no place within which God can be circumscribed, or from which he can be excluded; yet every one must perceive the possibility of some places being distinguished by his presence, or some symbol of his presence, different from what is common to others.

What more illustrious manifestation of the divine

* 1 Kings viii. 13. † Exod. xv. 17.

presence, then, was there in the tabernacle and temple, than in other places? Certainly that bright and sacred cloud which the scriptures denominate "glory,"* and the Jews call *shechinah*;† which for a long time accompanied the tabernacle, and afterwards removed into the temple.‡ Nor is it usual in the scriptures for the appellation of "holy" to be given to any places, but such as were illustrated by that preternatural cloud, or by some other remarkable symbol of the divine presence. Thus the place in the neighbourhood of the bush from which the Lord addressed Moses, was called "holy "ground,"§ on account of the glory of God displayed in that bush. Thus also Sinai and Sion were called "holy"‖ mountains, because they were both illustrated with the splendid symbol of the divine presence. The same remark may be applied to that which the apostle Peter has called "the holy "mount;" which, like the others already mentioned, had been consecrated by the same glory.¶ The same character also belongs to "the sanctuary of the "Lord"** at Shechem; which was distinguished by that appellation, because God had formerly appeared there to Abraham.†† The sanctity of the place was the sole reason of the command given to Joshua near Jericho, to put off his shoes from his feet; and the only cause of that sanctity was the presence of the angel who was "the captain of the Lord's host," the representative as it were of God himself: of whom Kimchi says; 'His dignity and sanctity con-'secrated the place where he appeared to Joshua.'‡‡

* כבוד Exod. xvi. 10. xxiv. 16. † שכינה or *habitation*. ‡ 1 Kings viii. 11. § Exod. iii. 5. ‖ Psal. lxviii. 17. ii. 6. ¶ II Pet. i. 18. Matt. xvii. 2. 5. ** Josh. xxiv. 26. †† Gen. xii. 6, 7. ‡‡ In Josh. v. 15.

It is of no importance, that this splendour, denominated "the glory of the Lord," did not at all times display its radiance in the sanctuary in a manner visible to the corporeal eye. For the Deity, whose presence that splendour represented, having once entered into his sanctuary, would have it thenceforward considered as his permanent habitation.* He said, "I have hallowed this house, to put my "name there forever; and mine eyes and mine heart "shall be there perpetually."† And there he continued his residence till he removed and fixed it in a far most illustrious manner in his spiritual temple, the christian church.

III. It is worthy of observation also, that God prohibited sacrifices to be offered to him any where except in his sanctuary;‡ that the priests who entered into it to minister, were considered as "coming "near to God and standing before him;"§ that those who appeared in the sanctuary are said to have "appeared before the Lord God;"‖ that whatever was done there is represented as having been done "before the Lord;"¶ and that from the innermost part of the sanctuary God used to deliver his sacred oracles:** all which were so many indications of his special presence.

IV. The same conclusion may be drawn from the metaphorical use of the word *temple*. For the sole ground upon which Christ gave this appellation to his body,†† was, that in him "dwelt all the fullness"‡‡ of that divine majesty, which in a shadowy and symbolical manner inhabited the ancient temple. His

* Exod. xv. 17. † I Kings ix. 3. ‡ Deut. xii. 13, 14. § Ezek. xliv. 15.
‖ Exod. xxiii. 17. xxxiv. 24. ¶ Exod. xxviii. 12. xxx. 8. Levit. i. 5.
** Exod. xxv. 22. Numb. vii. 89. †† John ii. 19, 21. ‡‡ Col. ii. 9.

flesh also is called a "vail,"* as being the residence of the Divinity which dwelt in a symbolical manner within the vail of the inner sanctuary. Why does the apostle designate Christians as "the temple of "God?" Because "the spirit of God dwelleth in "them."† For the same reason, he declares their bodies to be "the temple of the Holy Ghost."‡ Observe his language to the Ephesians: "Now "therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, "but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the house-"hold of God; and are built upon the foundation of "the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself "being the chief corner stone; in whom all the "building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy "temple in the Lord: in whom also ye are builded "together for an habitation of God through the "Spirit."§ In this passage, as he calls the Ephesian church "an habitation of God," on account of the Holy Spirit dwelling in it, so he denominates the universal church of Christ "an holy temple," for the same reason and in the same sense. And the only cause to be assigned for his adoption of this phraseology, is, that the temple of Jerusalem was considered as the residence of the Deity, from which he has transferred the appellation of temple to the christian church.

V. The same opinion of the nature of the temple has been held by the Jews. They say that both in the wilderness and in Canaan itself there were three camps, the camp of the people, the camp of the Levites, and the camp of God. For to the camp of the people in the wilderness afterwards corresponded the city of Jerusalem: to the camp of the

* Heb. x. 20. † I Cor. 3. 16. ‡ I Cor. vi. 19. § Ephes. ii. 19—22.

Levites, the mountain of the house; where the Levites kept guard about the temple, as they had formerly done around the tabernacle: and the tabernacle was succeeded by the temple; each of them being considered by the Jews as a sacred place in which God dwelt among his people, as their king and lord. To this purpose is the following passage of Maimonides. 'In the wilderness there were three camps: the camp 'of Israel, which itself was also fourfold; the camp 'of the Levites, whose place it was, as we have 'stated, to pitch their tents round the sacred taber-'nacle; and the camp of the Divine Majesty, situated 'within the gate of the court of the congregation. 'To these things there are others which perpetually 'correspond: the whole space between the gate of 'Jerusalem and the gate of the mountain of the 'house; which is considered in the same light as the 'camp of Israel: the space extending from the gate 'of the mountain of the house to the gate of the sanc-'tuary called Nicanor; which answers to the camp 'of the Levites: and the space within the gate of the 'sanctuary; which was the camp of the Divine Ma-'jesty."* These things serve to elucidate an observation of the apostle to the Hebrews. "For the "bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into "the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned "without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he "might sanctify the people with his own blood, suf-"fered without the gate."† He evidently assumes it as a thing admitted and known, that the city of Jerusalem, in succeeding times, corresponded to the camp of Israel in the wilderness; and assigns it as a reason why Christ was put to death without the gate

* Beth Habechira, c. 7. † Heb. xiii. 11, 12.

of Jerusalem, that those sacrifices which were the most eminent types of the sacrifice of Christ, used to be burned without the camp.

But these things are only remarked in passing: we must now return to the immediate subject of discussion, which is illustrated by the paraphrase of Nachmanides on these words of the law: "Let them "make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among "them." His words are: 'Let them make a house and 'furniture, as for the sanctuary of a king and a royal 'palace; and I will dwell in the midst of them, in the 'palace, and on the throne of glory, which they shall 'make me:' where, as he calls the sanctuary of God *a royal palace;* so, on account of the sacredness of a king's person, he calls a royal palace *a sanctuary.**

Nachmanides is followed by Isaac Abarbinel: 'The sanctuary of God has various names; the ta-'bernacle of the congregation, the dwelling place of 'the Lord, the habitation of testimony, and the 'sanctuary of the Lord. It is denominated the 'tabernacle of the congregation; because in the 'wilderness it had the appearance of a tabernacle 'or tent, consisting of curtains and poles. It is 'called a dwelling place; because the Divine Ma-'jesty resided in it. It is styled the habitation of 'testimony; because in it were deposited the book 'and the tables of the law, which served as a testi-'mony between the Israelites and their Father who 'is in heaven. Finally, it is called a sanctuary; 'because it was unlawful for uncircumcised and un-'clean persons to enter it.'† A little after he says: 'In the temple were the table and the candlestick, 'and the altar of incense, as things adapted to the

* In Exod. xxv. 8. † Ad Exod xxv. 8.

'service of the king of the universe: not that he, 'to whom be all praise, needed any of them; far be 'it from us to entertain such a supposition: but in 'order to impress it deeply on the minds of the peo-'ple, that the Lord God of Israel was present in the 'midst of their camp.'

The following passage is from Rabbi Schem Tob. 'God, to whom be praise, commanded a house to 'be erected for him, resembling a royal palace. In 'a royal palace are found all those things which we 'have mentioned. There are some persons, who 'guard the palace; others, who execute offices be-'longing to the regal dignity; who furnish the 'banquets, and do other things necessary for the 'monarch: others, who daily entertain him with 'music, both vocal and instrumental. In a royal 'palace there is a place appointed for the prepa-'tion of the victuals; and another where perfumes 'are burned. In the palace of a king there is also a 'table, and an apartment exclusively appropriated to 'himself; which no one ever enters, except him who 'is next in authority, or those whom he regards with 'the greatest affection. In like manner, it was the 'will of God to have all these in his house, that he 'might not in any thing give place to the kings of the 'earth. For he is a great king; not indeed in any want 'of these things: but hence it is easy to see the rea-'son of the daily provisions given to the priests and 'Levites, being what every monarch is accustomed 'to allow to his servants. And all these things were 'intended to instruct the people, that the Lord of 'Hosts was present among us. For he is a great 'king, and to be feared by all the nations."*

* Ad Moreh Nevochim, par. iii. c. 45.

VI. The Jews, then, have regarded both the tabernacle and the temple, in succession, as a royal mansion erected to be a habitation for God, in which he was considered as residing among his people, just as the kings of the earth are accustomed to reside among their subjects. Hence, the Jews suppose, the very splendid furniture of the sanctuary, and the highly magnificent equipage as it were of a domestic establishment. Hence the exceedingly ample retinue, and the various ministers appointed to various offices: some, who procured the things required for the sacred service; others, who guarded the house; others employed as musicians, who, while the holocausts were burning, and the wine was poured out with the appointed solemnities, sang with the voice, blew the trumpets, and played on the stringed instruments. Hence the table always furnished with bread, the fire continually blazing on the altar, the incense burned twice every day, and twice every day the members of the slaughtered victims laid on the altar of God as on a table, and accompanied with salt, and wine, and flour. Hence the celebration of solemn days, and feasts held at stated seasons. Hence the many rooms attached to the temple, necessary to so large an establishment. For these things were not contrived by human invention, but appointed by divine inspiration.*

VII. The sanctuary of God being the shadowy abode of his peculiar presence, this very circumstance required, and God himself commanded, a place so august and sacred to be regarded with great reverence.† How great was the reverence in which it was held by the Jews, sufficiently appears from the

* I Chron. xxviii. 12. † Levit. xix. 30. xxvi. 2. Eccles. v. 1.

following passages of Maimonides. 'The reverence 'of the sanctuary rests on an affirmative precept. 'For it is said, Ye shall reverence my sanctuary. 'You are not, however, to reverence the sanctuary 'itself, but him by whom the reverence of it has been 'enjoined. What, then, is the reverence due to it? 'That no one enter the mountain of the house with a 'staff, with shoes on his feet, with a coat that has 'pockets, or with dusty feet. It is unnecessary to 'state, that it is not lawful to spit upon the mountain 'of the house, but that any accidental excretion of 'saliva is to be received in the garment. Nor may 'any one take the mountain of the house for a tho-'roughfare, so as, after having entered at one gate, 'to go out at another, and thereby shorten his road; 'but he must go round it on the outside, nor ever 'enter it but for the sake of performing duty.' And a little after: 'When a person, after having performed 'any service, withdraws from the sanctuary, he shall 'not turn his back towards the temple, but he shall 'retire by gentle steps sideways till he shall have left 'the sanctuary. Thus also the guards of the temple, 'and the stationary men, and the Levites after hav-'ing returned in the same manner from the desk in 'which they have read the prayers, ought to retire 'from the sanctuary. But reverence for the sanc-'tuary likewise includes all the following things. 'That no one carelessly shake his head before the 'eastern gate of the sanctuary, called Nicanor, be-'cause it is situated opposite to the holy of holies: 'that every person, who enters the sanctuary, walk 'with all the modesty in his power. But the reve-'rence itself is, that every one stand before the Lord 'God, because it is said, Mine eyes and mine heart

'shall be there continually: and that he walk with 'awe, reverence, and fear; because it is said, In 'the house of our God we will walk with trem- 'bling.'*

VIII. Because the inner sanctuary was an emblem of the highest heaven, and the special seat of the Divine majesty, therefore every part of the temple was esteemed by the Jews more or less holy, in proportion to its greater or less proximity to that sanctuary. This appears from the following passage of Maimonides, which I the more readily transcribe, because it expresses the estimate which the Jews formed of all places. 'The whole land of Israel is 'more holy than all other lands. But what is its 'holiness? From it they bring a homer of the har- 'vest, two loaves at Pentecost, and the first fruits;† 'which they bring not from other lands. Cities sur- 'rounded with walls are more holy than the rest of 'the land; because from them lepers are excluded, 'nor is a dead body ever buried in them, except by 'the consent either of seven magistrates or of all the 'citizens. But if a dead body has been carried out 'of any such city, it is not lawful to carry it back, 'even though all the citizens consent to it. Jerusa- 'lem is more holy than other walled cities; because 'the minor sacrifices and tithes are eaten within its 'precincts. The mountain of the house is more 'holy than Jerusalem; because neither men nor 'women labouring under an issue, nor women dur- 'ing the seasons of purification, are allowed to 'enter it. But a dead body may be carried into it, 'and it is therefore unnecessary to state that access is 'likewise permitted to a person defiled with a dead

* Beth Habechira, c. 7. † Levit. xxiii.

'body. The intermural is more holy than the mountain of the house; because strangers and persons 'defiled with a dead body, or polluted by forbidden 'intercourse, are not allowed to enter it. The court 'of the women is more holy than the intermural; 'for no access is permitted to any one on the same 'day in which he has been washed on account of 'impurity. But this prohibition is only by a decree 'of the Sanhedrim. For a person who has been 'washed on account of impurity is permitted by the 'law to enter into the camp of the Levites on the 'day of his ablution.* Nor is he guilty of a crime, 'who enters into the court of the women when he is 'defiled with a dead body. The court of Israel is 'more holy than the court of the women; for there 'no one can lawfully enter, who wants any expiation. 'The court of the priests is more holy than the court 'of Israel; for it is never entered by Israelites except for the sake of performing some duty, such as 'to lay hands upon a victim, to make a confession of 'sins over it, to slay it, or to wave the divided 'members. That part of the court of the priests 'which lies between the porch and the altar, is more 'holy than the other part of it; for it is not to be 'entered by priests with any blemish, with the head 'covered, or with torn garments.' This aggravated the crime of those who murdered Zacharias there. 'The temple is more holy than that part of the court 'of the priests which lies between the porch and the 'altar; for there no one is lawfully admitted but 'with washed hands and feet. The inner sanctuary 'is more holy than the temple; for it is unlawful 'for any one to enter there except the high priest

* Levit. xvi. 22.

'alone, and even for him except only on the day of 'expiation, at the precise time appointed for that ser-'vice.' This interior sanctuary, as Abarbinel himself has observed,* was an image of the highest heaven. Here was the propitiatory or mercy seat, as the divine footstool: here were the cherubim, as the celestial ministers; between whom God is said to have dwelt,† and whence he promised to deliver his oracles.‡ It is no wonder therefore, that so sacred a place was shut against all but the high priest alone, who was the principal advocate and intercessor with God on behalf of the people.

IX. The same custom was followed by the heathens in many of the temples of their gods. 'Some 'fanes,' says Minutius Felix, 'are allowed to be en-'tered once in a year: some are never permitted to 'be seen at all.' Thus also Pausanias (*in Bœot.*) says of the temple of Cybele; 'They deem it lawful 'to open the temple one day in every year, and no 'more.' And in the same book, respecting the temple of Eurynomene: 'On the same day in every year 'they open the temple of Eurynomene; but it has 'not been appointed for them to open it at any other 'time.' Thus also (*in secund. Eliac.*) of the temple of Pluto: 'It is opened once in every year; but then 'no one is permitted to enter, except the priest." The same author (*in Arcad.*) relates that the temple of the equestrian Neptune was always shut against every person. Thus it appears to have been the opinion of heathens, that temples rightly dedicated were mansions and habitations of the gods, and were filled with their divinity; and that for this reason they ought seldom or never to be entered by men.

* Ad Levit. xvi. † Psal. lxxx. 1. xcix. 1. ‡ Exod. xxv. 22.

CHAPTER IV.

The Ministers of Sacrifices.

MANY writers, both Jews and Christians, suppose that in the early ages of the world the priesthood was one of the privileges of primogeniture; and they adduce several arguments in support of their opinion. The first is, that all the first born of the Hebrews were devoted to God, who by a special claim called them his own.* And those whom God declares to be his and sacred or devoted to him, they apprehend to have been priests.—Their next argument is, that the Levites, who were ministers of religion, were devoted to God instead of the first born, and substituted in their room; so that whatever character was conferred upon the Levites after their substitution in the room of the first born, that character must have been sustained by the first born as long as they held their original place. This is thought to be implied in the statement, that Moses employed "young men" to offer sacrifices;† where the appellation of "young men" is supposed to indicate their being some of the first born.—Their last argument is, that Esau, for having undervalued and sold his right of primogeniture, is stigmatized with the character of a "profane person."‡ The reason of this is concluded to be, that by bartering the privilege of his birth-right for a mean consideration he deprived himself of the priesthood, which was acting the part of a profane person.

II. But notwithstanding the plausibility of these arguments, I think it is possible to answer them and

* Num. viii. 17. † Exod. xxiv. 5. ‡ Heb. xii. 16.

to adduce some other considerations which invalidate this opinion.

Though the first born of the Hebrews were devoted to God, yet this resulted not from any privilege of primogeniture, or right to the priesthood, but was in consequence of God's preservation of them, when all the first born of the Egyptians were suddenly destroyed.* It was the will of God that all the first born in Israel, both man and beast, whom he preserved alive when those of the Egyptians were slain, should thenceforward be devoted to himself. But this devotion of the first born was not known except among the Hebrews, and not even among the Hebrews themselves before that time; nor did it prevail among them afterwards so as for the first born to be priests, but a kind of portion belonging to the priests, from whom they were to be redeemed by the payment of five shekels for each individual.† Nor is it any more to the purpose that the Levites, though it is true that they were ministers of religion, succeeded to the place of the first born. For notwithstanding this appointment, they were not priests, but assistants of the priests; nor did they even act in this capacity till they had been consecrated to their office by certain solemn rites.

Nor does the account of Moses having "sent "young men which offered burnt offerings and sacri-"ficed peace offerings,"‡ if rightly understood, afford any confirmation of this sentiment. There is no evidence that those young men were selected from among the first born; nor, whoever they were, did they sprinkle the blood upon the altar, which was the peculiar office of the priests. This was performed

* Num. iii. 13. viii. 17. † Num. xviii. 16. ‡ Exod. xxiv. 5.

by Moses himself,* who at that time united both the pontifical† and regal‡ dignities in his own person. Hence it is reasonable to conclude that those young men are said to have offered the victims, because they brought them to the altar; which is what the scriptures every where express by the word *offering;* and this oblation, in regard to the sacrifices of individuals, was the proper office of those persons on whose behalf they were immolated; nor, in the case of sacrifices for the whole congregation, did it always belong to the priests, but to other persons who represented that congregation.

Nor, in the last place, do I allow much weight to the argument drawn from the appellation of a "profane person," given to Esau for having sold his birth-right.§ I consider the apostle in that passage as referring the birth-right of Esau, not to the priesthood, but to a double portion of the paternal inheritance and to the regal dignity. For the regal dignity and an ampler inheritance, which belonged to the first born by a divine and sacred right, a right of the highest antiquity,‖ and founded in nature itself,¶ were divine privileges, which no person could undervalue without justly incurring the charge of profaneness; especially in those times when such things were evidences of the peculiar favour of God.

III. These considerations induce me to conclude, that it was the custom of the remotest antiquity for every individual to act as his own priest, in sacrifices offered for himself alone. Cain and Abel, it is evident from the scripture,** offered, each his own oblation. This one fact proves that in the earliest times

* Exod. xxxiv. 6. † Psal. xcix. 6. ‡ Deut. xxxiii. 5. § Heb. xii. 16.
‖ Gen. iv. 7. xliii. 33. ¶ Deut. xxi. 17. ** Gen. iv. 3, 4.

the first born had no such right to the priesthood as debarred all others from performing sacrificial acts: since Abel the younger brother, as well as Cain the first born, brought an offering to the Lord, and one that was acceptable. Those who imagine that the offerings which Cain and Abel intended for God, were brought together to Adam, in order to be offered by him in due form, allege nothing in support of such a supposition; which, as we have already hinted, is manifestly irreconcileable with the language of scripture.

In the sacrifices designed for every family, there can be no doubt that the father of the family was entitled to officiate as its priest: and in the exercise of this right, Noah and Job offered sacrifices for themselves and their respective families.

In succeeding times when sacrifices came to be offered for communities consisting of various families, it was the custom for the prince of each community, if he chose, to perform the public services to the Deity. In virtue of this right it was, that, before the consecration of Aaron, Moses sprinkled the altar with the blood which confirmed the solemn covenant.* Melchisedec also, before the time of Moses, was at once both a king and a priest;† and was invested with such a priesthood as never distinguished any other, except Christ himself. For as no mention is made of the father or mother, of the birth or death, of that great and most illustrious personage, which is contrary to the custom of Moses in the case of all other eminent men; hence he is described as "without father, without mother, without descent, "having neither beginning of days nor end of life;"

* Exod. xxiv. 6. † Gen. xiv. 18. Heb. vii. 1.

and is also represented as "abiding a priest continually."

And it is worthy of observation, that it is no very uncommon phraseology, to speak of great and illustrious men, whose parents are not mentioned, as having no parents. Seneca names two kings, of 'of whom,' he says, 'one has no father, and the 'other no mother:' in explanation of which he immediately adds, 'that doubts are entertained respecting the mother of Servius, and that no mention 'is made of any father of Ancus.'* On this subject Canuleius, in Livy, contradicts Seneca, but makes use of the same mode of expression: for 'that 'Servius was born of a female captive named Corniculana, but that he had no father.'† To the same purpose is the following passage of Horace: 'You 'believe, with truth, that often before the government and ignoble reign of Tullius many men, descended from no ancestors, lived virtuous lives and 'were distinguished by great honours.'‡ As eminent and celebrated men, therefore, whose parents are not named, are described as born of no parents; so in the same kind of phraseology, but under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Melchisedec is said to have had neither beginning of days nor end of life. And as that which has neither commencement nor termination is exhibited as eternal, the case of Melchisedec, being so ordered by God, afforded a suitable adumbration of eternity. But what was prefigured in him, was actually fulfilled in Christ.

These things however belong not to this place. My design at present is only to shew, that in the early ages of the world it was the custom for the

* Epist. 108. † Lib. iv. c. 3. ‡ Lib. i. Sat. 6. ver. 8.

king and prince of every state to offer the public sacrifices to God. Virgil describes Anius at Delphi 'as both king of men and priest of Apollo:'* on which Servius remarks; 'It was the custom of the 'ancients for a king to be also a priest or high priest: 'whence we in the present day call the emperors 'high priests.' The same commentator, on another passage of Virgil,—'Dost thou watch, thou off-'spring of the gods, Æneas? Watch,'†—says: 'This 'is the language of religion: for the vestal virgins on 'a certain day used to go to the king of the sacred 'ceremonies, and say, Dost thou watch, king? 'Watch: which Virgil justly attributes to Æneas, as 'being a king, and always introduced by him, as 'sustaining the pontifical character, and skilled in 'religious rites.'

IV. But among the Israelites after their departure from Egypt into the wilderness, the priesthood was separated from the sovereignty, and was transferred to Aaron and his posterity by the command of God. The functions peculiar to the priesthood, to offer sacrifices to God and to bless the people in his name, were immediately assigned to them: but they were afterwards appointed also to determine all subjects relating to religion, and to judge of things clean and unclean; which, however, must be considered as offices belonging to them, not in the capacity of priests, but as persons skilled in the divine law. Hence, when the duties to which the priests were consecrated are specified in the scripture, they are represented as consisting in these two things; performing the rites of divine worship, and commending the people to the favour of God by solemn prayer. "Them," says

* Æneid. lib. iii. ver. 80. † Æneid. lib. x. ver. 228.

Moses, referring to the Aaronic priests, "the Lord "thy God hath chosen, to minister unto him, and to "bless in the name of the Lord."* And another scriptural authority states that "Aaron was separated; "that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and "his sons forever, to burn incense before the Lord, "to minister unto him, and to bless in his name for "ever."† The other offices, the decision of controversies and the interpretation of the sacred laws, were functions not peculiar to the priests, but common also to others: and persons might lawfully be chosen to be teachers or judges, not only from the descendants of Aaron, but also from any other family.

V. In the Aaronic priesthood, the law established two orders or degrees; of which the superior was allotted to Aaron himself and to his successors in the pontifical dignity, and the inferior was assigned to the other priests. Hence it appears, that those functions which the scriptures attribute to Aaron as peculiar to himself belonged exclusively to the high priests, and that the rest of the offices might be legitimately performed by the other priests. In these two orders of the priesthood, however, there were eight stations, or degrees of dignity, constituted by the appointment of the Sanhedrim.

The first of these was assigned to the high priest. It was the dignity of the high priest that he was to be married to none but a pure virgin; that he was not to be present at any funeral, to defile himself for his parents, or to rend his garments at their death, or that of any other of his relatives:‡ to which the Jews add many other things as conducive to the honour of

*ut. xxi. 5. † 1 Chron. xxiii. 13. ‡ Lev. xxi. 10, 11. 13.

the pontificate. The high priest, they say,* ought to excel his brethren in five particulars. These, according to some rabbies, are—'elegance of form, 'strength, riches, wisdom, and beauty of com-'plexion.'† Both elegance of form and beauty of complexion are said to be required as indications of a good disposition. Others, however, consider beauty of complexion not so much to be regarded as advanced age.‡ Nor is Maimonides sufficiently consistent with himself, who to the other four requisites adds as a fifth, at one time, beauty of complexion, and at another, eminent fidelity. 'It is established,' he says, 'as a fundamental principle among us, that it is ne-'cessary for the high priest not to be inferior to any 'other priest of his time in wisdom, fidelity, form, 'riches, or strength.' But if the heir of the high priest happened to be inferior to any other, only in riches, and not in the other qualifications, it was deemed right that so great a man should be enriched with the property of the other priests to such an extent as to render him the most wealthy of them all.§ For it was not without good cause that the Sanhedrim, whose province the Jews apprehend it was to appoint the high priest, adjudged the pontificate to the heir of the preceding high priest; it being an established rule among the Hebrews, that 'to whomsoever belongs 'the primary right to the inheritance, to him also be-'longs the first claim to the dignity of the deceased:'‖ and according to this rule, if the other qualifications

* Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 5. Bartenora ad Joma, c. 1. Auct. lib. Siphr. in Parascha, אמור c. 2.

† Aaron Ben Chajim ad dict. Siphr. loc.

‡ Rabboth in אמור. Baal Hatturim ad Levit. xxi.

§ Rabboth ad אמור. Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 5. Bartenora ad Joma, c. 1. ‖ Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 4.

were possessed, the high priesthood descended to the heir of the deceased high priest.

But the pontifical office was further directed and its dignity secured, by the following regulations: that that every one invested with it should seclude himself from the populace; that he should not expose himself to the people naked; that he should always carefully abstain from public baths and feasts, and invariably preserve the gravity which became him; that, if he wished to visit persons in grief, he should go accompanied by other priests; that he should cut his hair every week, but should never shave it with a razor; that he should attend the sanctuary daily, and not go home more than twice every day; that he should not be compelled to give testimony, except in cases which concerned the king, nor even in those but at the requisition of the Sanhedrim; that he should have only one wife at a time; that on entering the temple he should take three other priests with him; that he should perform the sacred rites, not by lot, like the other priests, but as often as he was inclined, and should take to himself whatever sacrifice he pleased.*

The second station in the priesthood was filled by the high priest's deputy, whom the Jews called *sagan*,† and who was the assistant of the high priest in almost all his duties.

In the third place ranked those whom the Jews, by a corruption of a Greek term, call the two *katholikin*: respecting whom Maimonides says, that 'the place of 'the katholikin is to do for the sagan what the sagan 'does for the high priest.'‡ But other writers affirm

* Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 5. † Ibid. c. 4.
‡ Maimon. ibid.

that these officers were superintendents of the treasurers, and auditors of their accounts.'*

The fourth place was allotted to seven keepers of the keys of the sanctuary; to whom, however, those keys were committed in such a manner that no one of them could open the gate assigned to him, at his own pleasure, without the presence and consent of them all.†

In the fifth place were appointed three treasurers; who were to receive all sacred revenues from whomsoever, due and the price of the things redeemed. To this purpose is the following passage of Maimonides: 'They manage the redemption of things estimated, devoted, and consecrated, and of tythes:' and again; 'They receive all consecrated things, and dismiss 'those which are redeemed; but they dismiss them on 'those conditions on which such things ought to be 'dismissed.'‡

The sixth place was assigned to the head of the watch. For, according to Maimonides, the whole number of priests was distributed by Moses into eight classes,§ but David afterwards divided them into twenty-four;‖ each of which, being appointed to minister in the sanctuary for a week in rotation, had its own chief, and he was called the head of the watch.

The seventh place was filled by him who was called the head of the house of his fathers.¶ For as the whole number of priests was divided into twenty-four classes, so every class was divided into seven families according to the number of days in every week; and the service of a day was allotted in rotation to each

* Glossa in Shekalim in Talmud. Hierosol. c. 5. Baal Aruch & Buxtorf. in voc. קהליקין

† Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 4. & ad Shekal. c. 5. Bartenor. ibid.

‡ Ibid. § Chele Mikdash, c. 4. ‖ 1 Chron. xxiv. ¶ Maimon. ibid.

family; the prince or chief of which was entitled the head of the house of his fathers. A similar division into classes and families was made among the Levites, and those whom we have mentioned under the title of Stationary men.*

The last place was left to the common priests, who were not invested with any peculiar office.†

Beside all these there was likewise a priest called *the anointed for war:* whose business it was, when the people were marching to battle, to encourage them to fight manfully.‡ To him was attached the greatest honour in the camp, next to the high priest; but he had no distinction in the sanctuary beyond any of the common priests.§

* Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 4. † Ibid. c. 4. ‡ Deut. xx. 2, 3, 4.
§ Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 4.

CHAPTER V.

The Consecration of the Aaronic Priests.

THAT no species of sanctity or honour might be wanting to the priesthood, the Aaronic priests were consecrated to their office by various rites and ceremonies; being first purified with water, then clothed with garments proper for each of them, after that anointed with holy oil, and, in the last place, duly expiated and initiated by the sacrifice of certain victims.

The first part of the consecration commenced, as we have said, with ablution;* to teach them the necessity of holiness to the proper discharge of so holy an office. For a similar reason it is that we who are under the christian dispensation, are introduced into the new covenant by initiation at the sacred font. Thus also, when persons descended from foreign families, became proselytes to the Jewish religion, it was the custom for them to be immersed in water.† The same mode of initiating their devotees was practised among heathens. Hence Clemens Alexandrinus says: 'The mysteries of the Greeks begin with expiations, as those of the Barbarians do with ablutions.'‡ Hence also Tertullian: 'In the Eleusinian mysteries, and in the rites performed in honour of Apollo, they certainly practise ablution, and this they presume to do in order to obtain regeneration, and impunity for their perjuries. Among the ancients, whoever had polluted himself with murder, expiated the crime by a purgation in water.'§ To

* Exod. xxix. 4. Levit. viii. 6. † Maimon. in Isure Bia. c. 13.
‡ Stromat. 5. § De Baptismo, c. 5.

the same purpose is a passage of Augustine: 'Men 'are said to be baptized in many of the sacrilegious 'services of idols.'*

II. As soon as the lustrations had been duly performed on Aaron and his Sons, Aaron himself was first arrayed with the pontifical attire; the splendour and magnificence of which were proportioned to the dignity of the priesthood, and of the services to be performed. Hence the pontifical garments are said to have been made "for glory and for beauty."† The vestments of the high priest were the Coat, the Drawers or Breeches, the Girdle, the Robe, the Ephod, the Breastplate, the Mitre, and the Holy Crown: all which being very beautiful, and some of them made of gold, they have been called by the Jews *golden vestments.* These were put upon Aaron, and used to be worn by every high priest in the performance of all the sacred functions, except only on the day of annual atonement. In the services of that day no others were worn than the Coat, the Drawers, the Girdle and the Mitre: these were made of linen, and are called by the Jews *white vestments.* Grief became that day, and pompous attire is unsuitable to grief.

III. Of all the pontifical garments, the first that were put on were the Drawers, which reached from the loins to the knees.‡ The flamens of the heathens used to expose before Peor, parts which it most of all became them to conceal: but as God required his priests to be modest, so it was his will that their bodies should be covered. This also was the reason why there was a sloping ascent to the altar: "neither "shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy

* De Baptismo contra Donatistas. † Exod. xxviii. 2.
‡ Maimon. in Chele Mikdash. c. 10. Kimchi ad Ezek. xliv. 18.

"nakedness be not discovered thereon."* It was for the same reason, as Abarbinel has justly observed, that whereas the other sacred vestments were put upon Aaron by Moses, Aaron, with a proper regard to modesty, put on the drawers himself in private.†

To the drawers was added the Coat, a vesture made of linen, with sleeves, and finely embroidered, reaching down to the feet.‡

The coat was fastened with the Girdle, which was a linen belt, three § or four ‖ fingers broad, and thirty-two cubits long, passing several times round the body: this was designed to defend the priests from the cold, and to strengthen them for their laborious employment.

After the girdle, was put on the Robe, which was a blue vesture,¶ without sleeves,** divided from the collar into two parts, of which one descended over the breast, and the other hung from the back part of the neck nearly down to the ankles. Appended to the hems at the bottom were seventy-two little bells, separated from each other by the like number of pomegranates of curious workmanship.††

To the robe was added the Ephod, made "of gold, "of blue, and of purple, of scarlet, and fine twined "linen, with cunning work:"‡‡ of which the fore part reached from the arms to the bottom of the chest, and the hinder part almost to the ankles. To the part which hung over the back were joined two belts, brought from the sides under the arms and tied upon the breast. These, like the ephod itself,

* Exod. xx. 26. † Exod. xxviii. 40—43. xxix. 5, 6. Levit. viii. 7—9.
‡ Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 8. 10. § Ibid. c. 8.
‖ Joseph. Antiq. l. iii. c. 8. ¶ Joseph. ibid. Philo Jud. de Vit. Mos.
** Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 9. †† Exod. xxxix. 22—26.
‡‡ Exod. xxviii. 6.

and is also represented as "abiding a priest continually."

And it is worthy of observation, that it is no very uncommon phraseology, to speak of great and illustrious men, whose parents are not mentioned, as having no parents. Seneca names two kings, of 'of whom,' he says, 'one has no father, and the 'other no mother:' in explanation of which he immediately adds, 'that doubts are entertained respecting the mother of Servius, and that no mention 'is made of any father of Ancus.'* On this subject Canuleius, in Livy, contradicts Seneca, but makes use of the same mode of expression: for 'that 'Servius was born of a female captive named Corniculana, but that he had no father.'† To the same purpose is the following passage of Horace: 'You 'believe, with truth, that often before the government and ignoble reign of Tullius many men, descended from no ancestors, lived virtuous lives and 'were distinguished by great honours.'‡ As eminent and celebrated men, therefore, whose parents are not named, are described as born of no parents; so in the same kind of phraseology, but under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Melchisedec is said to have had neither beginning of days nor end of life. And as that which has neither commencement nor termination is exhibited as eternal, the case of Melchisedec, being so ordered by God, afforded a suitable adumbration of eternity. But what was prefigured in him, was actually fulfilled in Christ.

These things however belong not to this place. My design at present is only to shew, that in the early ages of the world it was the custom for the

* Epist. 108. † Lib. iv. c. 3. ‡ Lib. i. Sat. 6. ver. 8.

king and prince of every state to offer the public sacrifices to God. Virgil describes Anius at Delphi 'as both king of men and priest of Apollo:'* on which Servius remarks; 'It was the custom of the 'ancients for a king to be also a priest or high priest: 'whence we in the present day call the emperors 'high priests.' The same commentator, on another passage of Virgil,—'Dost thou watch, thou off-'spring of the gods, Æneas? Watch,'†—says: 'This 'is the language of religion: for the vestal virgins on 'a certain day used to go to the king of the sacred 'ceremonies, and say, Dost thou watch, king? 'Watch: which Virgil justly attributes to Æneas, as 'being a king, and always introduced by him, as 'sustaining the pontifical character, and skilled in 'religious rites.'

IV. But among the Israelites after their departure from Egypt into the wilderness, the priesthood was separated from the sovereignty, and was transferred to Aaron and his posterity by the command of God. The functions peculiar to the priesthood, to offer sacrifices to God and to bless the people in his name, were immediately assigned to them: but they were afterwards appointed also to determine all subjects relating to religion, and to judge of things clean and unclean; which, however, must be considered as offices belonging to them, not in the capacity of priests, but as persons skilled in the divine law. Hence, when the duties to which the priests were consecrated are specified in the scripture, they are represented as consisting in these two things; performing the rites of divine worship, and commending the people to the favour of God by solemn prayer. "Them," says

* Æneid. lib. iii. ver. 80. † Æneid. lib. x. ver. 222.

says: 'On the head he wears a cap, not pointed, nor "extending over his whole head, but covering a little "more than half of it.'* Thus, according to the Jews, between the Mitre and the Holy Crown there was a convenient place for the phylacteries. God directed his priests to officiate with their heads covered, because among the eastern nations a covered head was a sign of reverence, and an uncovered one, of confidence: for which reason the passages where Moses says, "the children of Israel went out with a high "hand,"† are rendered by the Chaldee Paraphrast, 'they went out with an uncovered head.'

Lastly, the forehead of the high priest was adorned with a plate of gold, called "the Holy Crown;" which was kept in its proper position by "a lace of blue," drawn through two holes made in the two ends of it, and tied on the back part of the head.‡ To shew that the high priest was consecrated to God, there was an inscription on the crown, engraven "like the engrav-"ings of a signet, HOLINESS TO THE LORD." It was customary for the priests of other nations also to wear crowns in the performance of their sacred functions, as we are informed by Pliny: 'Anciently indeed no 'crown was given except to some god, but never by 'one man to another in any games: and it is said that 'the first of all was Bacchus, who placed on his own 'head a crown of ivy: crowns were afterwards 'assumed by priests in honour of the gods; and very 'recently they have also been used in solemn games.'§ To this add the following passage of Tertullian: 'In 'the same manner, therefore, the purple robe and the 'ornament of gold worn round the neck were ensigns

* Antiq. L. iii. c. 8. † Exod. xiv. 8. Num. xxxiii. 3.
‡ Exod. xxxix. 30, 31. § Histor. Nat. lib. xvi. c. 4.

'of dignity among the Egyptians and Babylonians. 'In a similar manner also splendid robes and golden 'crowns are worn by provincial priests, but not with 'the same condition.'*

III. When arrayed with these vestments, Aaron was further dignified by being anointed with the holy oil;† which the Jews say was first profusely poured upon his head, and thence drawn over his forehead so as to describe on it, according to some the Greek letter Chi (X), according to others the Greek Kappa (K), or according to others the Hebrew Caph (כ); which is the first letter of the word *priest* in that language:‡ for there is nothing which the Jews leave uninvolved in their subtleties.§ The holy unction, however, was significant of honour and joy, as well as of sanctity and divine inspiration. In allusion to this, David says: "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest "wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed "thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."‖ Hence it is also, that the Son of God, being endued with the Holy Spirit without measure,¶ is called Messiah, the Christ, the Anointed.** Hence likewise Christians themselves, who are made spiritual kings and priests,†† are said to be "anointed," and to have "received an unction."‡‡ Hence, in the last place, among the ancient Christians, unction was connected with baptism. 'Afterwards, when we are come out of 'the baptistery,' says Tertullian, 'we are anointed all 'over with a blessed unction, according to the ancient 'custom of anointing with oil as a consecration to the 'priesthood. Thus Aaron was anointed by Moses;

* De Idololat. c. 18. † Exod. xxix. 7. xxx. 25. Levit. viii. 12.
‡ כוף § Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 1. Abarbin. ad. I Reg. i.
‖ Psalm xlv. 7. ¶ John iii. 34. ** משיח, ὁ Χριστος. †† Rev. i. 6.
‡‡ II Cor. i. 21. I John ii. 20. 27.

'thus Christ is denominated from chrism, that is, 'unction, which has given a name to the Lord.'*

IV. These rites having been performed upon Aaron, his sons were next enrobed with the vestments appointed for them.† The garments of the common priests were the Drawers or Breeches, the Coat,‡ the Girdle, and the Bonnet. The first two were like those of the high priest. The Bonnet was the same as the Mitre worn by the high priest, but folded in a different manner: for the common priests, as we have just quoted from Josephus respecting the high priest, bound their bonnets round their heads in the shape of a helmet.§ The Girdles of the inferior priests were of the same form as that of the high priest; but less costly, and of less elegant texture. These four garments were of linen, such as were worn by the Egyptian priests as emblems of innocence.‖ But they were not fit for use, if they were defaced with filth, or injured by age.¶ Cicero has observed, from Plato, 'that 'white is a colour peculiarly becoming the Deity.**

V. The due completion of all these ceremonies was followed by the oblation of three sacrifices for Aaron and his sons; first, a sin offering; secondly, a burnt offering; and lastly, a peace offering.†† The sin offering was a kind of expiation by which they were first of all to be purified. The holocaust, or whole burnt offering, was a gift or present to recommend them to their Lord. The peace offering was a sacred feast by which they were introduced into the family of God. For even the offerers themselves were permitted to feed upon the peace offerings; and those who

* De Baptism. c. 7. † Exod. xxix. 8, 9. Levit. viii. 13.
‡ The Coat is sometimes called "a linen ephod." I Sam. ii. 18. xxii. 18.
§ Maimon. in Chele Mikdash, c. 8. ‖ Plutarch de Isid. et Osirid.
¶ Maimon. ibid. ** De Legib. L. ii. †† Exod. xxix. Levit. viii.

rightly fed upon them were considered as God's domestics. Respecting these victims, of which one was a bullock and the other two were rams, Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson makes the following observations: 'It is 'proper to notice the reason of the order in which 'these sacrifices were offered. For first of all an 'atonement for sins was made by the sin offering: of 'which nothing, but the fat, was offered to God, to 'whom be praise; because the offerers were not yet 'worthy of God's acceptance of a gift and present 'from them. But after they had been purified; to 'indicate their being devoted to the sacred office, they 'immolated to God (to whom be praise) a holocaust, 'which was entirely consumed upon the altar. And 'after the holocaust they offered a sacrifice resembling 'a peace offering (of which part used to be given to 'God, part to the priests, and part to the offerers) 'which was designed to indicate their being now re-'ceived into favour with God, so as to use one com-'mon table with him.'* Similar observations are made by Isaac Abarbinel in his commentaries on the same passage.

With the blood of the ram, which, as we have said, was immolated as a peace offering, were then imbued the right ears of all the priests, and the thumbs of their right hands, and the great toes of their right feet.† By this ceremony every priest was admonished what great attention he was required to give to the study of the law, to the sacred services, and to his *ways*, a term by which the Hebrews denote the general conduct. To this purpose are the following remarks of Abarbinel. 'The design of all these things was to 'teach every priest that he ought to apply himself

* Ad Exod. xxix. † Exod. xxix. 20. Levit. viii. 23, 24.

'with diligence to the study of the sacred law, that 'his hands ought to be sedulously employed in the 'sacred ministry, and that he was to walk in the ways 'and commandments of God. These ceremonies were 'performed on the right ear, the thumb of the right 'hand, and the great toe of the right foot, to teach 'every priest that his hearing, his actions, and his 'manners, ought always to have a right tendency: 'for the *right* denotes perfection.'* The same things are remarked by Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson.†

VI. After these things were done, Moses, who was appointed to officiate as a priest in these solemnities, "took, of the ram" last mentioned, "the fat and "the rump, and all the fat that covereth the inwards, "and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys "and their fat, and the right shoulder; and one loaf "of bread, and one cake of oiled bread, and one un-"leavened wafer, and put all in the hands of Aaron "and of his sons;" and placing his hands under their hands, he "waved them" all to and fro, and presented them to God the possessor of all things; and having thus presented them, he "took them from off their "hands," and proceeded to "burn them upon the "altar."‡ The breast of this ram he waved in the same manner, and took for himself, it being his share, as he had done the duty of a priest. Then he sprinkled Aaron and his sons, and all their garments, with blood taken from the altar, and with the holy oil. In this manner he consecrated both the priests themselves and the sacerdotal vestments.§ But the blood used for this rite was from the same ram, with the entrails of which, as we have just stated, the hands of the priests

* Ad Exod. xxix. † Ibid. ‡ Lev. viii. 25—28. Exod. xxix. 22—25.
§ Levit. viii. 29, 30.

were filled: for which reason this ram was called *the ram of fillings.**

VII. By these rites and ceremonies, repeated for seven successive days, the whole family of Aaron was originally invested with the priesthood.† But as long as any of the holy oil remained, all Aaron's successors in the priesthood, when about to enter on their office, were anointed, and arrayed with the pontifical vestments, for the same number of days.‡ Hence the high priest is sometimes designated in the scripture as "the priest "that is anointed."§ But after the consumption of the sacred oil made by Moses, which the Jews affirm was never made again,‖ it was a sufficient investment in the high priesthood to be arrayed in the pontifical robes for seven successive days. Hence every high priest invested in this manner is described by the Jews, as *initiated with the vestments*:¶ whether this tradition is correct or erroneous it behoves them to consider. I would not rashly affirm any thing respecting the fact. The law plainly required that every high priest, before entering on the office, should be anointed with the holy oil:** nor do the scriptures contain any prohibition of making a further quantity of that oil. The passage adduced by the Jews on this subject forbids, not the recomposition, but the profane use of it.††

The case of the high priest differed from that of the common priests; who were never consecrated afresh after the original consecration of their fathers, the immediate sons of Aaron. The reason of this difference was, that the pontificate descended according to personal claims, but the priesthood by he-

* איל המלאים Exod. xxix 31. Levit. viii. 22. † Levit. viii. 33, 34.
‡ Exod. xxix. 29, 30. § Levit. iv. 3. 5. 16. ‖ Abarb. in 1 Reg. i.
¶ Maimon. in Chel. Mik. c. 4 ** Exod. xxix. 29, 30. †† Exod. xxx. 31—33.

reditary right. It is worthy of observation that the same custom prevailed also in the unction of kings. For among the Hebrews, no kings were anointed, except those who were the first of their respective families that filled the throne, such as Saul and David (to say nothing here of Jehu) or those whose right to the throne of their fathers was disputed, such as Solomon, Joash, and Jehoahaz. On this subject Maimonides remarks: 'They do not anoint a king 'who is the son of a king; because the kingdom is the 'perpetual inheritance of the king; as is evident from 'these words; "he and his children in the midst of 'Israel."* But, if there happen to be any dispute 'respecting the kingdom, then they anoint the king, 'with a view to terminate all controversy, and to 'afford a stronger assurance to all persons that this 'individual ought to be regarded as the king. Thus 'Solomon was anointed in consequence of the com-'motion raised by Adonijah, Joash on account of the 'tyranny of Athaliah, and Jehoahaz in order to dis-'inherit Jehoiakim.' For, as Abarbinel observes, Jehoahaz was the younger of these brothers,† but, being in greater favour with the people, was created king by them, and not by the Sanhedrim. And this seems to be implied in the sacred history, which, without any mention of the princes or rulers, states that "the people of the land took Jehoahaz, and anointed "him, and made him king."‡ It was the custom of the Jews, therefore, to anoint to any office requiring that ceremony, persons who had no previous claim, or an uncertain one, to such an office: but persons whose right was universally admitted, were considered as sufficiently consecrated by the right itself.

* Deut. xvii. 20. † II Kings xxiii. 31. 36. ‡ II Kings xxiii 30.

CHAPTER VI.

The Integrity of Life, Perfection of Body, and Purity of Family, required in the Aaronic Priests.

HAVING now, we trust, sufficiently described the rites and ceremonies by which the Aaronic priests were consecrated to the priesthood, we proceed to shew the integrity of life, perfection of body, and purity of family required in the priests. For as the rites enjoined on the Jews were of the most select description, so there was a very particular selection of the ministers by whom those rites were to be performed. It was deemed unlawful for any one to exercise the sacred functions who answered to any of the following characters: 'An idolater, a stranger, one distinguished 'by any corporeal deformity, uncircumcised, unclean, 'purified by ablution and officiating on the day of 'his purification, without expiation, mourning, a 'drunkard, destitute of garments, overloaded with 'garments, having torn garments, with long hair, 'with unwashed hands or feet, sitting, having any 'thing placed between his feet and the ground, hav-'ing any thing placed between his hand and the 'sacred vessels, using his left hand instead of his 'right. All such persons are forbidden to officiate: 'if they officiate, they pollute the solemnities; except 'those who have had long hair, worn tattered gar-'ments, or offered a victim to any strange God 'through inadvertence; whose ministry, if they had 'already officiated, was considered as legitimate.' This is the statement of Maimonides,* the particulars of which we are now to examine.

* In Biath Hamikdash, c. 9.

II.—1. He says, that every one was degraded from the priesthood, who had worshipped any strange god. The Jews conclude this from the vision of Ezekiel, which represents the priests who had been guilty of idolatry as evidently deprived of the priesthood, and their subsequent conversion to God as available no further than to procure them permission to execute some inferior offices.* The same punishment was inflicted, even for a smaller crime, by Josiah; who entirely removed from the altar those priests who had offered sacrifices to the true God in the high places.† On which Grotius remarks; 'Other crimes, followed by penitence, did not remove the guilty from the sacerdotal function: idolatry, and worship in an unlawful place, were punished by deposition.'

2. Nor could the sacerdotal office be lawfully sustained, except by the descendants of Aaron. All others, in reference to this office, the Jews call *strangers;* and death was the punishment denounced against any stranger who should intrude into it.‡ Hence there were registers kept of the whole sacerdotal race. Hence, as Maimonides tells us, every one's family was examined before he could be admitted into the priesthood. 'The great Sanhedrim sit 'in the room *Gazeth*, and their daily business is to 'judge of the families and blemishes of the priests. 'Every priest, whose family is found not to belong 'to the priesthood, clothing himself with a mourning 'garment, and covering his head with a mourning veil, 'immediately walks out of the sanctuary. But he 'whose family is deemed legitimate and his body per-'fect, immediately putting on the white vestments,

* Ezek. xliv. 10—13. † II Kings xxiii. 9. ‡ Numb. iii. 10.

'goes away and ministers with his brethren, the 'priests of the same family. He that is pronounced 'descended from a legitimate family, but yet is de-'formed by any corporeal blemish, sits in the wood 'room and separates all the wormed wood from the 'rest, that it may not be brought to the altar. He 'partakes of the sacred food, however, with his fa-'ther's family. For of such it is said;* "He shall 'eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy 'and of the holy."†

To preserve the priesthood also from any disgrace, great caution was always to be used in the marriage of the priests. The high priest was not allowed even to marry a widow; and the common priests were forbidden to marry any woman that was unchaste, or divorced, or profane:‡ to which the Jewish doctors add, a widow rejected by the brother of a deceased husband; deeming such a woman equally disgraced with those who had been divorced. It is also to be inferred from the statement of Ezekiel in his divine vision,§ that no widow was to be married even to a common priest, unless she had been the wife of a priest before.‖ If any priest, unlawfully married, refused to put away his wife, he was pu-

* Levit. xxi. 22. † Maimon. in Biath Hamikdash, c. vi. Vid. etiam Misnam in Middoth, c. 5. ‡ Levit. xxi. 7. 14. § Ezek. xliv. 22.

‖ Most of the Jews consider זנה which we render *a harlot*, as signifying every woman who had been defiled by any man, and whom it was not lawful to marry, and likewise every female of foreign race: they understand חללה which is generally rendered *profane*, as denoting a female begotten either by the high priest on a widow, or by a common priest on a harlot, or a woman divorced from a former husband. *Maimon. in Isur. Bia.* c. 18, 19. *R. Solomon ad Lev.* 21. But others, with rather more simplicity, understand זנה to mean a known harlot, and חללה a woman of suspected chastity; such as female slaves, captives, and inn-keepers. *Joseph. Antiq.* L. iii. c. 10.

nished by a removal from the sacred ministry. 'A 'priest connected in an unlawful marriage does not 'officiate,' says Maimonides, 'till by a solemn pro-'mise made according to the judgment of others, an 'engagement of inviolable obligation, he has pledged 'himself before the Sanhedrim, that he will not per-'sist in this sin. Then he officiates, goes home, and 'puts away every unlawful wife.'*

3. That no one disfigured by any corporeal deformity should ever exercise the sacerdotal functions, was expressly provided in the scriptures. "Whoso-"ever he be of thy seed in their generations, that "hath any blemish, let him not approach to offer the "bread of his God: a blind man, or a lame, or he "that hath a flat nose, or any thing superfluous, or "a man that is broken footed, or broken handed, or "crookbacked, or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish "in his eye, or be scurvy, &c."† The blemishes which disqualified for the sacerdotal office are not limited by the Jews to those which are enumerated in this law, but are extended to all others which resemble these, and of which Maimonides reckons up a hundred and forty.‡ 'Priests are defiled,' he says, 'not only by the blemishes mentioned in the law, but 'also by all others whatsoever visible in the body. 'Wherefore it is said, "No man that hath a blemish"§ 'in any part whatsoever. The blemishes specified in 'the law are proposed as examples of the rest.'‖

4. They were also to be excluded from the altars, who had not been circumcised. The same rule was applicable to uncircumcision and to foreign extraction. Respecting foreign extraction God declares by

* Biath Hamikdash, c. 6. † Levit. xxi. 17, &c.
‡ Biath Hamikdash, c. 8. § Levit. xxi. 21. ‖ Ibid. c. 6.

Ezekiel: "No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, or "uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanc-"tuary."*

5. Access to the altars was also prohibited to those who were defiled by any ceremonial impurity. For while those priests who were disfigured by corporeal deformity, though they were allowed to eat of the holy things, were not permitted to perform any of the sacred offices, much less could the sacerdotal functions be lawfully performed by such as were unclean, to whom the participation of the holy things was forbidden.† Of impurity, Maimonides informs us, there were in all eleven sources;‡ among which the greatest impurity was occasioned by a human corpse, which not only defiled persons who touched it, but immediately polluted all who entered the tent in which it lay, to such a degree as to communicate the impurity to every thing that they touched.§ And for this reason it was enjoined by the law, that the high priest should "not defile himself for his father "or for his mother," and that of the other priests there should "none be defiled but for his mother, "and for his father, and for his son, and for his "daughter, and for his brother, and for his sister, "a virgin which had no husband;" and that when they mourned, they were to use no external ceremonies, "neither to make baldness upon their head, "nor to shave off the corner of their beard, nor to "make any cuttings in their flesh."‖

* Ezek. xliv. 9. † Levit. xxxii. 4.

‡ Immunditia reptilium, immunditia morticini, immunditia cadaveris humani, immunditia ex semine ejecto orta, immunditia aquæ piacularis, immunditia victimarum piacularium, immunditia viri fluxione affecti, immunditia fœminæ fluxione laborantis, immunditia fœminæ menstruatæ, immunditia puerperæ, et immunditia lepræ. *Præf. ad Mikvaoth in Misna.*

§ Numb. xix. 14. 22. ‖ Levit. xxi. 1—3, 5. 11.

Even among the heathens, a human corpse was considered as causing impurity sufficient to remove from the altars and sacrifices every person polluted with funeral offices. Servius says, 'It was the custom of the Romans, for persons polluted with funeral rites, to abstain from offering sacrifices:' and in another place: 'It was a Roman custom to put a branch of cypress before the house where a dead body lay, lest any chief priest, entering it, should through ignorance be polluted.'* To the same purpose Porphyry remarks: 'Priests and diviners enjoin both themselves and others to keep at a distance from sepulchres.'†

6. It was likewise unlawful for any one to officiate in the sacred services on the same day on which he had been washed in order to his purification; for, notwithstanding his being washed with water, he was to wait till sunset for his purification to be complete.‡

7. Nor could the sacred functions be rightly performed a by priest who needed expiation. Expiation was considered as necessary for those who had passed the whole time fixed for the continuance of their impurity, without having offered those sacrifices by which their purification was to be effected. On this subject hear Maimonides. 'Four § kinds of persons are said to need expiation. But how is it that every one of these is said to need expiation? Because there is something still wanting to every such person, though purified from uncleanness, though washed with water, though the sun be set; for he is not so clean as to be able rightly to eat of the

* In Æneid. L. xi. & iii. † De Abstinen. L. ii. s. 50. ‡ Lev. xxii. 6, 7.

§ Fœmina fluxione laborans, puerpera; vir fluxione affectus, et leprosus. *Mechuss. cappar.* c. i.

'holy things, till he has offered the sacrifice com-
'manded for him.'

8. Nor were the divine services to be performed by those who were in mourning. For as the blemished priests, though they were allowed to eat of the holy things, were not permitted to exercise the sacred functions; much less, says Maimonides, could any of the sacerdotal offices be discharged by such as were in mourning, to whom even the participation of holy things was prohibited.* A priest was deemed to be in mourning, on the death of any one of his relatives for whom he might lawfully be defiled. The time which the Jews apprehend to have been allotted by the law to the mourning of a priest, was only that one day on which any of his relatives died, who were within the description we have mentioned. Yet it was the judgment of the great Sanhedrim, that the mourning of the priest should include the whole space of time intervening between the death and the funeral of his deceased relative, and even the whole of the funeral day.†

9. Every priest, when about to perform the sacred services, was also to abstain from wine and strong drink. This was God's command to Aaron. "Do "not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons "with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the "congregation, lest ye die: it shall be a statute for "ever throughout your generations: and that ye may "put difference between holy and unholy, and be-"tween clean and unclean."‡ This very explicit injunction has been involved in wonderful perplexity by the Jews, who speak of it in the following manner.

* In Biath Hamikdash, c. ii. Levit. xxi. 21—23. x. 19. Deut. xxvi. 14. Hos. ix. 4. † Maimon. in Biath Hamikdash, c. ii. ‡ Levit. x. 9, 10.

'A priest prepared for service, just after having 'drunk some wine, is forbidden to penetrate beyond 'the altar. If he penetrate any further and officiate, 'his ministry is vain, and he is devoted to death to 'be inflicted by the hand of God: for it is said, "lest 'ye die." But this is to be understood of him who 'has drunk a quarter of a log' (a Jewish measure equal to five sixths of a pint) 'of fresh wine forty 'days old, without any space of time having elapsed 'after his drinking it. But if he has drunk less than 'a quarter of a log, or even if he has drunk a quarter 'of a log, but either some interval of time has passed 'after his drinking it, or he has mixed water with 'the wine, or finally if he has drunk wine less than 'forty days old,—then, although he has drunk more 'than a quarter of a log, he is free from blame, nor 'does he profane his ministry. But if he has drunk 'more than a quarter of a log of older wine, then, 'although he has mixed it with water, and though 'some time has passed since his drinking it, he is 'nevertheless devoted to death, and his ministry is 'also polluted.' If a priest performed the sacred functions when he was inebriated with any other liquor than wine, the opinion of the Jews respecting him is, that neither was his ministry vain, nor was he liable to death; but they tell us, that he was to be scourged.*

But to dismiss these subtleties, the reason of the abstinence from wine and strong drink, to be observed by the priests when about to officiate in the sacred services, was, that they might retain the full use of their reason, and be free from the incitements of lust. † On the same accounts wine was very

* Maimon. in Biath Hamikdash, c. i. † Levit. x. 10.

sparingly used by the Egyptian priests; of whom Porphyry says: 'Some drank no wine at all, and 'others drank very little, assigning as the rea-'sons, that it injured the nerves, caused the head-'ach, obstructed invention, and excited libidinous 'desires.*

10. Every priest was likewise commanded never to engage in the divine services, without being clothed in his proper vestments. For, as we have already stated, there were proper vestments appointed for each order of the priesthood, and death was denounced against those who should officiate without being clothed with them.† In reference to this point Maimonides observes, respecting the priests: 'When 'invested with the proper robes, they were also in-'vested with the priesthood; but when divested of 'their robes, they were also divested of the priesthood, 'and accounted as strangers. And as it is declared, "the stranger that cometh nigh" to minister "shall "be put to death."‡

11. It was equally provided, that the priests, when about to officiate, should not put on more garments than those which were appointed for them; for, as a certain number of vestments was appointed for the priesthood, every priest was to adhere to the number which God had commanded.§

12. It was also deemed irregular for those priests to officiate whose garments were torn. To rend the garments was the custom of mourners.‖ Hence the Jews conclude, that those whose garments were torn were equally interdicted the sacred ministrations with such as were in mourning.

* De Abstinen. L. ii. s. 6. † Exod. xxviii. 40—43.
‡ In Chele Hamikdash, c. x. Num. iii. 10. § Maimon. ibid. ‖ Levit. x. 6.

13. To these must be added another class, described in terms which are understood by Christians to signify one whose head was uncovered, and by Jews, one whose hair had been suffered to grow long.* But every one was considered as letting his hair grow long, who kept it uncut, like a Nazarite, for thirty days;† which the high priest, who was required to attend daily in the sanctuary, was never permitted to do.‡ This was not unlawful for the other priests, except when it was their turn to officiate in the sanctuary. But as the high priest was forbidden to let his hair grow, so all the other priests were prohibited from shaving their heads.§ On the contrary, this was generally practised by some of the heathen priests. Such is the representation of Minucius Felix: 'Isis mourns laments and seeks after 'her lost son with Cynocephalus and bald priests.'‖ So Lampridius: 'He observed the rites of Isis, so 'that he both shaved his head, and carried about 'Anubis.'¶ Thus Herodotus: 'The priests of the 'gods in other countries wear long hair, but in 'Egypt they are shaved:** neither of which was permitted to the high priest of the Hebrews.

14. Nor was it lawful for any one to officiate with unwashed hands or feet. The priests were directed to wash their hands and feet with water when entering on the sacred services; and death was denounced against all who should disobey this injunction.†† Thus also it was the custom among other nations to wash before the celebration of their sacred rites.

* See the rabbinical commentators on Levit. x. 6. xxi. 10.
† Maimon. in Biath Hamikdash, c. i. ‡ Levit. xxi. 10.
§ Ezek. xliv. 20. ‖ In Octavio. ¶ De Commodo.
** In Euterpe. Vide etiam Plutarch. de Isid. et Osirid.
†† Exod. xxx. 20, 21.

Hence the observation of Hector in Homer: 'I dread 'to pour out generous wine in libations to Jupiter 'with unwashed hands:* and the following direction of Hesiod: 'Never in the morning with un-'washed hands make libations of generous wine to 'Jupiter or the other immortals;'† and the advice of a character in Plautus: 'If any persons offer sacri-'fices, let them always fetch water from this place.'‡

15. It was likewise deemed a profanation of the sacred rites, for any one to officiate at them *sitting;* which would be paying less reverence to the immortal God, than even among mortals a master of a family is accustomed to receive from his servants. Hence the observation of Maimonides: 'There is no 'service performed without standing: because it is 'said, "to stand to minister." Whoever therefore 'officiates sitting, is profane, and his ministry is 'vain.'§ The same observation is made by Rabbi Solomon Jarchi.‖ And not only the priests, but all other persons, used to stand at the performance of all the services in the sanctuary. Hence also another remark of Maimonides: 'No one prays aright unless 'he stands:'¶ and hence the appellation of *stationary men*, given by the Jews to those who attended the public services as representatives of the whole nation, and of *station* or *standing*, used to designate the duty which such persons performed.

16. There was also believed to be a defect in the ministrations of every priest, who had any thing placed between his feet and the pavement of the court. Whoever officiated in this manner, it was deemed the same as if he had officiated with shoes on

* Iliad. vi. 266. † Oper. et Dier. L. ii. 342. ‡ In Rudente.

§ Deut. xviii. 5. Maimon. in Blath Hamikdash, c. v. Vide etiam Chrysost. ad Heb. x. 11. ‖ Ad Deut. xviii. 5. ¶ Tephilla Ubircath Cohen, c. v.

his feet. But that it was not lawful to enter the sanctuary with shoes on the feet, not even to minister, is concluded by all the Jews from the command given to Moses and to Joshua, when they stood on holy ground, to put off their shoes.* This custom was imitated by Pythagoras, whose third maxim is: 'Sacrifice and adore without shoes on your feet.'† This was designed to teach that God was to be invariably worshipped with reverence.

17. The holy things were also considered as improperly handled by those who had any thing placed between their hands and the sacred utensils. The services were to be performed with washed hands and feet: but it would have been altogether useless to wash the hands, unless they were also used naked.

18. Finally, it was deemed by the Jews highly unbecoming the sacred services, to employ the left hand instead of the right. For the right hand of Aaron and the right hands of his sons were consecrated with sacrificial blood on their initiation into the priesthood.‡ The labour of the right hand has also been accounted more auspicious, and therefore preferable for the offices of religion.

III. But on this point every one may form his own opinion. It is evident, that of those rites which were used by the priests of other nations, some were enjoined on the priests of the Hebrews, and others were expressly forbidden to them; and that in these things God adopted such a selection as (not to say any more in this place) would add some peculiar honour to his ceremonies and priests. But these observations may suffice on this subject. Let us now proceed to the Levites, who were given to the Hebrew priests as their assistants.

* Exod, iii. 5. Josh. v. 15. † Apud Jamblich. ‡ Levit, viii. 23, 24.

CHAPTER VII.

The Levites.

IN the assistants of the priests, who, after the ancestor from whom they descended, are denominated Levites, we are principally to consider the three following things; their consecration, their office, and the age at which that office was to be undertaken.

The consecration commenced with lustral water, with which they were sprinkled in a solemn manner, that they might enter on the sacred office in a purified state.* The same mode of purification was also appointed for persons defiled by a dead body.† With this water were mingled cedar wood, hyssop, scarlet, and ashes of the red heifer.‡ The effect of this water was at once to purify the persons so defiled, and to defile such as were pure:§ the former, because the red heifer whose ashes were mingled with it was an expiatory victim slain for the purpose of purifying the people; the latter, perhaps, because such victims as were burned without the camp, being considered as contaminated by the sins of the guilty transferred to them, defiled all who touched them by a communication of that impurity. For the red heifer which we have mentioned, belonged to that class of victims; and, being burned without the camp, defiled even the persons employed in burning it.‖

After having been sprinkled with lustral water, the Levites were commanded, in the next place, as an emblem of further purification, to shave their bodies with

* Num. viii. 7. † Num. xix. 13. ‡ Num. xix. 6. 9.
§ Num xix. 17, 18, 19. 21. ‖ Levit. xvi. 27, 28. Num. xix. 2—8.

a razor.* Of this rite Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson gives the following account: 'God commanded them to 'shave all the hair entirely off from their bodies, 'thereby intending to remind them, that, renouncing 'as far as possible all care of corporeal things, they 'should wholly devote themselves to their sacred mi-'nistry.' Moreover, lest their purified bodies should be again defiled by impure clothing, they were also commanded to wash their garments.†

Being purified by these rites, and consecrated by the imposition of the hands of the people, which was the next part of the ceremony, they were offered by Aaron as living sacrifices before the Lord.‡ Being thus given instead of the first born, they were immediately allotted by God to the priests as sacred servants.§ Still there wanted, especially as they were about to enter on the sacred office, an expiatory victim to make an atonement for their sins. A bullock was therefore offered for a sin offering: after which the ceremony was completed by their offering another bullock for a burnt offering, together with a meat offering, as a present to their Lord: and after these oblations they were admitted into his family.

II. Initiated by these rites, they immediately entered on their office; which was not always the same, but varied according to the circumstances of different times. Before the sacred ark had obtained a permanent station, it was the business of the Levites to take charge of the tabernacle; and all the parts, furniture, and utensils of it, whenever it was to be removed, they were either to carry on their own shoulders, or to place on the waggons allotted to them for its conveyance from place to place. The

* Num. viii. 7. † Ibid. ‡ Num. viii. 9, 10. § Num. viii. 18, 19.

ark, the table of the shew bread, the two altars, the candlestick, and indeed all the holy vessels were to be borne upon the shoulders of the sons of Kohath. But the curtains and coverings of the tabernacle, which were under the care of the sons of Gershon; and its bars, pillars, and sockets, with every thing else of that kind, which were confided to the sons of Merari; were to be carried about on waggons. Hence it was, that waggons and oxen were given to the families of Gershon and Merari, but not to the family of Kohath.*

When the place of the ark was not to be changed any more, there was no further occasion for these labours of the Levites: in consequence of which David, who fixed the ark in Jerusalem as its permanent station, appointed some of them to be officers and judges in civil affairs, some to be porters at the gates of the temple, some to celebrate the praises of God with music both vocal and instrumental, and others to assist the priests in all things relating to the sanctuary. These last prepared the shew bread, the fine flour, and the unleavened cakes: whenever it was necessary, as it was at the principal festivals, they slew and flayed the victims; and performed other offices which existing circumstances required.†

III. During the continuance of the tabernacle, the Levites were called to different duties of their office at different ages; to the charge of the sanctuary on the completion of their twenty-fifth year; but not to bearing burdens on their shoulders, or laying them on waggons, when they were under thirty, or upwards of fifty. Thus are reconciled the two apparently in-

* Num. vii. 7—9.

† I Chron. xxiii. 4, 5. 26, 28, 29. II Chron. xxix. 16. 34. xxxiv. 6. 11.

consistent injunctions, of which one directs the ministry of the Levites to commence from the thirtieth year, and the other from the twenty-fifth.* The former relates to those more burdensome labours which I have mentioned, and the latter to the care of the tabernacle. These different employments required persons of different ages and different degrees of strength. I know that some persons endeavour to obviate this difficulty by another solution. They suppose the Levites to have been called to a course of instruction for their office at their twenty-fifth year, but not to the actual performance of its functions till the completion of their thirtieth.† But this supposition, as Abarbinel observes, is at variance with the scripture, which expressly states the Levites, at twenty-five years of age, to have been called "to wait "upon the service of the tabernacle," which clearly denotes, not instruction for their ministry, but the ministry itself:‡ and there can be no doubt that their instruction for their office began before that age.

But these remarks are to be understood of the Levites before they were numbered by David. For David, a little before his death, directed them to be called to their office "from twenty-years old and "upward."§ I say nothing here of such as were appointed to preside in civil affairs; but those who had attained that age, and were devoted to the service of the sanctuary, were divided, as we have before observed, into three orders; and each order was distributed into twenty-four classes. One of these orders was appointed to assist the priests; the second, to keep the gates of the sanctuary; and the third, to

* Num. iv. 3. viii. 24. † Maimon. in Chele Hamikdash. c. iii.
‡ Abarb. ad Num. viii. 24. § I Chron. xxiii. 27.

accompany the public solemnities with vocal and instrumental music. But it is said by the Jews, that, to preserve the divine worship from being disgraced by the less melodious notes of old men, every one more than fifty years of age was removed from the quire. This idea is conveyed in the following passage of Abarbinel. 'The Levites are incapacitated by 'age, not by corporeal blemishes. The priests are 'disqualified by corporeal blemishes, but not by 'age.'* For though the sons of priests were not accustomed to perform the sacred functions before they were twenty years old, yet, as the same author has remarked, there is no law of God forbidding them to officiate under that age. What then, according to the divine law, is the proper age for exercising the sacerdotal functions? The same, says Abarbinel, as for observing God's commands in general: 'A priest 'is really qualified for his office, as soon as he has 'attained an age capable of knowing his obligation 'to observe the precepts of the law. But the priests, 'his brethren, permit him not to officiate till the com-'pletion of his twentieth year.'

IV. As the Levites were given to be assistants to the priests, so were "the Nethinims appointed for the service of the Levites,"† but with considerable inferiority of condition. The Nethinims were descended from the Gibeonites, whom Joshua, on account of the league he had made with them, would not utterly destroy, but whom, on account of the fraud employed by them to accomplish that league, he devoted to perform the drudgery of the sanctuary; commanding them to be made "hewers of wood and drawers "of water."‡

* Ad Num. viii. † Ezra viii. 20. ‡ Josh. ix. 21.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Nature and different Kinds of Sacrifices, according to the Jews. Particular Account of the Meat Offerings.

THE preceding disquisition respecting the sacred places and the ministers of religion, appointed for the Hebrews, prepares us to enter with greater facility on an examination of their sacrifices. Since the Jews consider no dedicated things as *sacrifices* properly so called, except that class of oblations which the sacred writers name *Corban*,* we must first inquire what is it that the scripture designates by this term. It is applied to whatever was offered to God before an altar. Nor is any thing else ever distinguished by this appellation, except the wood provided for the sacred fires; which I suppose to have been so denominated, because it was designed to be used upon the altar.† Now all consecrated things ought to be considered as offered before an altar, which were brought to the door of the tabernacle; that being the place where God commanded sacrifices to be offered to him, and where the great altar was placed,‡ which after the erection of the temple was removed into the court of the priests: so that whatever was offered at the door of the tabernacle, was at the same time offered before the altar.

Of those things which were offered to God before the altar, some were dismissed and sent away, as the goat which was led into the wilderness; some were dedicated, entire and uninjured, to the service of the sanctuary; and others were cut in pieces and con-

* קרבן † Nehem. x. 34. xiii. 31. ‡ Levit. xvii. 4, 5, 6. Exod. xl. 6. 29.

sumed. Among those that were dedicated entire to the service of the sanctuary, were the vessels appropriated to the sacred uses, and the Levites appointed to assist in the sacred functions. The Levites were formally offered to God by Aaron, before the door of the tabernacle, and were called "an offering;" yet they were not slain as victims, but devoted alive and entire to the sacred office.* All those vessels of the sacred service, the chargers, bowls, and spoons, which the princes of the tribes contributed for the solemn dedication of the altar, were presented to God before the altar, on account of which they are also called "offerings,"† and were afterwards preserved entire for the service of the sanctuary. Hence it is, that neither the Levites, nor the vessels appropriated to sacred uses, notwithstanding they were offered to God, are ever reckoned among the sacrifices. The same observation must be made respecting the goat, which after having been offered to God before the altar was led away alive into the wilderness.

II. Those things which, being placed before the altar, or on the sacred table in the outer sanctuary, were offered to God in this manner in order to be consumed in due form, are included by the Jews in the number of the sacrifices. According to their opinion, then, a sacrifice may be defined, an offering duly consumed: or to be a little more explicit, a sacrifice among the Hebrews, was such a sacred oblation as was first offered to God, and then, in due form, cut in pieces and consumed. Sacrifices were duly consumed which were slain, burnt, poured out, or used for sacred feasts, with rites of divine institution. Of those rites

* Numb. viii. 10, 11. 12. † Numb. vii. 10, &c.

and ceremonies we shall have to treat more at large hereafter.

But the definition just given comprehends only those sacrifices, which, as we have already stated, are considered as such by the Jews, and which the scriptures call "oblations" or "offerings." I make this remark, because the scripture mentions some other victims, which, as they were never presented to God before his altar, are no where called oblations, and yet, I think, may justly be denominated expiatory sacrifices. In this class ought to be reckoned the bird killed for the purification of the leprosy; and also the heifer whose head was to be cut off for the expiation of murder in a case where the murderer was unknown. Though this heifer is not styled an offering in any passage of scripture, yet it was truly an expiatory victim, and in an extensive sense might, perhaps, be called a sacrifice; especially as the attendance of the priests was required on that occasion. Nor can any very different opinion be formed of the red heifer, whose ashes were to be kept for the purification of persons defiled with dead bodies. For, though that heifer was to be burned without the sanctuary, and even without the camp, there seems to be so much the greater propriety in classing it among the sacrifices, because its blood was to be sprinkled before the sanctuary seven times, and that by the hand of the priest: so that the life of that heifer was considered as presented and consecrated to God. The goat which on the solemn day of expiation was sent alive into the wilderness, bearing away the sins of the people that had been laid upon him, was presented before the Lord, and is expressly said "to make an atonement:" and may

indeed be called an expiatory victim, but not strictly a sacrifice, because it was not to be slain with sacrificial rites, but on the contrary, as far as appears from the law, was to be sent away alive into the wilderness. For as to the account of the Jews that this goat used to be precipitated from a certain mountain,* I am so far from thinking it to have been commanded by the law, that I should rather conclude it to have been forbidden. These things may serve to indicate the nature of those oblations, which were either sacrifices properly so called, or were piacular offerings, but less properly denominated sacrifices. The former were both offered to God, and afterwards slain and consumed. The latter, either were not offered, as the heifers which we have already mentioned; or were not slain and consumed, although they were duly presented to God, as the goat which was led away into the wilderness.†

III. Of those which were both offered and consumed with solemn rites, and which alone the Jews are accustomed to consider as sacrifices, some were selected from inanimate things, others from animals, and almost all from things that were used for human food: which God required to be devoted to himself, as the lord and giver of those things which contribute

* Misn. in Joma. c. 6.

† TR.—The author seems to have overlooked the connection of the *two goats* as constituting *one offering*. This has been set in a very clear and convincing light by Dr. Magee. 'Attend particularly to the fifth, seventh, 'and tenth verses of the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus, from which it ap-'pears, that the *two goats* are spoken of as *one* sin offering; being ex-'pressly so *called* in the first of these verses; presented *jointly* as the 'offering of the people in the second; and though separated into two 'distinct *parts*, by the lot cast in the ninth verse, yet *each* described as 'contributing to the *atonement* for the people, as appears from the tenth 'verse compared with the seventeenth.' *Disc. and Diss.* No. 71.

to the sustenance of life. An oblation of any thing inanimate, the scriptures designate by the term *mincha*,* which signifies *a present*, *offering*, *unbloody oblation*, *bread offering*, or *meat offering*. But any one selected from animals, with the exception of birds, is generally called by the Jews *zebach*,† *a victim*. This term is scarcely ever applied by the sacred writers to any sacrifices, except the peace offerings. But it is of little importance to contend about terms, provided we understand the things. All the sacrifices, therefore, which were selected from animals we shall call *victims*, and the rest *meat offerings*.

IV. All the meat offerings of the Jews were composed of wheaten or barley flour; some with, and others without, the addition of wine. Those which were accompanied with a libation of wine, the Jews, on account of the wine, called *drink offerings*;‡ and they were all to be mixed with oil, and were invariably to be connected with some kind of victims, and never to be offered without a victim. The victims, which God required to be always accompanied with meat offerings were all the burnt offerings of the whole congregation, with all those of individuals, and the peace offerings selected from the flock or the herd, but none taken from birds, except when birds were substituted for a quadruped, nor any sin offerings, except those offered by a purified leper.§ The three victims commanded to be offered by a leper at the time of his purification, the first for a trespass offering, the second for a sin offering, and the third for a burnt offering, were accompanied by three tenths of

* מנחה † זבח ‡ מנחות נסכים

§ Num. xv. 2, &c. xxviii. 29. Levit. xiv. 10. 31.

an ephah of fine flour. Hence it is generally concluded by the Jews, that one tenth of an ephah belonged to every victim: which is the more probable, because the burnt offering of a purified leper was of that class, to which the law given respecting such things prescribes the addition of only one tenth of an ephah. Concerning the addition of wine to the meat offering of a purified leper, the scripture contains no particular direction: but that wine was required to be added, the Jews conclude from the general law, which is given in the fifteenth chapter of Numbers, and which they understand as implying, that every burnt offering taken from the flock or the herd was to be accompanied with a meat offering, and that in every such meat offering wine was to be one of the ingredients.

V. But the same portion of flour, oil, and wine, was not to be used with every kind of animals; but one portion was required for bullocks, another for rams, another for goats and female sheep, and also for lambs and kids:—for bullocks, three tenths of an ephah of fine flour mingled with half a hin of oil, and half a hin of wine:—for rams, two tenths of an ephah of fine flour, mingled with the third part of a hin of oil, and the third part of a hin of wine:—and lastly, for goats and female sheep, as well as for lambs and kids, both male and female, only one tenth of an ephah of fine flour, mingled with the fourth part of a hin of oil, and the fourth part of a hin of wine.* But the lamb which was offered on the same day as the sheaf of the first fruits, was to be accompanied with two tenths of an ephah of fine flour.†

VI. Not very unlike the meat offerings which were accompanied with a drink offering of wine and

* Num. xv. Maimon. in Mase Korban, c. 2. † Levit. xxiii. 10—13.

were always to be seasoned with salt, appears to have been the salted meal which the heathens added to their victims, and which used also to be accompanied with wine. It is thus referred to by Virgil:* 'And 'now the dreadful day was arrived; the preparations 'to sacrifice me were commenced, and the salted 'meal was ready.' Servius's explanation is; 'Salt 'and barley, called salted meal, with which they used 'to sprinkle the forehead of the victim, the sacrificial 'fire, and the knives.'† After the salted meal it was also customary to pour wine on the head of the victim, which by that ceremony was said to be *macta*,‡ or *magis aucta*, *augmented*, or more increased. This ceremony is thus referred to by Ovid: 'Goat, gnaw 'the vine; yet its produce will be sufficient to be 'poured upon thy horns, when thou shalt stand be-'fore the altar.'§ It is likewise introduced, as part of the sacrificial process, by Virgil:‖ 'Here first the 'priestess places four black bullocks, and pours 'wine on their foreheads.'** But the Hebrews had another ceremony of laying the meat offerings accompanied with wine upon the altar. For among them it was customary to burn the whole meat offer-

* Æneid. ii. 132.

† What the Latins called *mola salsa*, the Greeks denominated *ουλαι*, *ουλοχυτα*, and *ουλοχυται*. For the *ουλαι*, as Eustathius informs us, consisted of 'a mixture of barley and salt, which they sprinkled on animals 'just about to be sacrificed.'

TR.—From *mola* were derived the words *immolo*, *immolatio*, to *immolate*, *immolation*; which by synechdoche came to be applied to the whole process of sacrificing.

‡ TR. Hence the words *macto* and *mactatio*, to express the killing of the victim, which immediately followed the affusion of the wine.

§ Fast. L. i. ‖ Æneid vi. 243.

**TR.—This rite forms part of another description in the same poem; 'The most beautiful Dido herself, holding a goblet in her right hand, 'pours wine between the horns of the white cow.' *Æneid* iv. 60.

ing upon the great altar, around the top which they use to pour the wine.*

VII. The meat offerings unaccompanied by any libations of wine, were either for the whole congregation of Israel, or for particular persons. Those for the whole congregation were three: the omer or sheaf of first fruits waved before the Lord; the two loaves offered on the day of Pentecost; and the loaves called the shew-bread.

The consecration of the omer of first fruits is stated by the Jews to have been conducted in the following manner: that three seahs of barley were shaken out of three sheaves in the court of the sanctuary; that from this quantity, winnowed, dried by fire, and bruised in a mortar, was selected one omer, which, being mixed with a log of oil, and a handful of frankincense, was first solemnly waved towards all the quarters of the world, as if to present it to God, the maker of all things, and then part was consumed on the altar, and the rest was given to the priests: before the oblation of which meat offering it was not lawful for any person to taste the new corn. That this omer was to be of barley, is said to have been handed down by tradition from Moses; and that it was really of this grain, may appear the more probable, because no corn was ever used in meat offerings, except wheat and barley; and the omer of first fruits was commanded to be offered on the sixteenth day of the month Nisan, before the wheat had grown to a full ear. For in all the land of Canaan, and the adjacent countries, the barley was among the fruits that ripened early, and the wheat was one of those that ripened late.

* Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 2.

The two loaves offered on the day of Pentecost, contained a tenth of an ephah each, made of the flour of new wheat. This kind of meat offering was to be offered to God by waving it before the altar; yet, because it was leavened, was not to be burnt on the altar, but was to be entirely given to the priests: for it was not lawful to burn on the altar any meat offerings that contained leaven. For this reason, the Jews say, the "leavened bread offered with sacrifices of "thanksgiving"* was not burnt on the altar, but given to the priests as the servants of God.

The bread called "shew bread," literally in the Hebrew *bread of faces*, is supposed by some persons to have been so called, because it had four sides, or faces.† But it is more justly concluded by others to have been thus denominated from its position on the sacred table in the outer sanctuary where it was "set "in order *before the Lord*."‡ It was made of fine wheaten flour, two tenths of an ephah being allotted to each cake. The cakes were to be twelve in number, to be placed on the golden table "in two rows, "six on a row, and pure frankincense" to be "put "upon each row." They were to be removed, and replaced by fresh ones, every sabbath day; when the removed cakes were to be given to the priests, and the frankincense was to be burnt on the great altar.§

Nor let any one wonder that these cakes placed on God's table, for the golden table was eminently his, used to be reckoned among the meat offerings, though they were not laid on the altar with the other offerings of this class. For, as the altar was God's table,‖ so the table was one of God's altars, and evidently

* Levit. vii. 13. † Abraham Harophe in Schilte Hagibborim, c. 74.
‡ לפני יהוה *before the faces of Jehovah*. § Levit. xxiv. 5—9. ‖ Mal. i. 12.

served the purpose of an altar, so that the cakes laid upon that table were considered as set before God, and as offered to him: which is fully implied in the language of the scripture, commanding them to be "set before the Lord," as we have already noticed.

Nor was this confined to the Jews; we find that dedicated tables served the purposes of altars also among the heathens. 'For in the Papyrian code,' says Macrobius, 'it is evidently stated, that a dedicated table may serve the purpose of an altar: as in the temple of Juno Populonia, there is said to be a consecrated table. For in temples, some things are utensils and vessels composing the sacred furniture, and other things are ornaments. The utensils and vessels are like necessary instruments, and are used in the performance of sacrifices. Shields, garlands, and similar votive gifts, are ornaments. Such gifts are not dedicated when the temple is consecrated; but tables and altars are usually dedicated on the same day as the temple itself. Wherefore a table thus solemnly dedicated in a temple serves the purpose of an altar, and obtains the same reverence as the temple in which it stands. It was therefore a legitimate libation that was made by Evander,* on that table which had been solemnly dedicated with the great altar, and in the consecrated grove, and in the sacred festivities in which they were engaged.'†

VIII. The meat offerings for particular persons are affirmed by the Jews to have been nine:‡ of which, they say, four were enjoined in the law, and the other five were the voluntary oblations of individuals. Of those which they consider as enjoined in the law,

* Virg. Æneid. viii. 279. † Saturnal. L. iii. c. 11.
‡ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 12, 13.

one is commonly called by them the meat offering *of initiation*, which they assert to have been commanded to be offered by every priest at his entrance on the priesthood: but of this command I cannot find that they produce any proof. They tell us, however, that this kind of meat offering consisted of one tenth of an ephah of fine wheaten flour, mixed with three logs of oil. Maimonides says: it used to be divided, in the case of a common priest, into ten cakes; and in the case of a high priest, into twelve; that a little frankincense was added to each cake, and all the cakes were to be burnt on the altar.

A second they call the meat offering *of the pan;* for which was allotted the same portion of flour and oil, and which, according to Maimonides, was also distributed into twelve cakes, which were so equally divided, that one half of each was offered in the morning, and half in the evening; a handful of frankincense added to them, being in the same manner divided and burnt. Every high priest was to offer a meat offering of this kind, when he was anointed with the sacred oil;* and, if we believe the Jews, from that time forwards, every day, as long as he held the pontificate: but of this also they bring no sufficient proof from the scriptures.

A third was the meat offering *of the sinner;* which contained one tenth of an ephah of wheaten flour, without the addition of any oil or frankincense.† This kind of offering was appointed for those who had been guilty of a sin requiring to be expiated by blood, but were not able to procure either a lamb or a kid, a turtle dove or a pigeon.‡

* Levit. vi. 20—22. † Levit. v. 5—13.

‡ TR.—From the case described above, some persons have attempted to

The fourth offering of this kind is commonly called the meat offering *of jealousy*; which a husband suspecting his wife of unchastity was to offer on her account, in order to prove her guilty or innocent. This offering consisted of one tenth of an ephah of barley meal, and, as in the last case, without the addition of any oil or frankincense.* For perfumes and delicacies were altogether incompatible with sacrifices offered for sins.

It is stated by the Jews, that the meat offerings which were merely voluntary oblations of individuals, were never to contain less than an ephah of flour each; but that they might contain more at the option of the offerer, provided a log of oil were added to each ephah of flour. But the same quantity of frankincense, namely a handful, they consider as having been sufficient for the largest meat offerings: and the frankincense added to the meat offerings, as ought to have been mentioned before, was in all cases to be

derive a general argument that the shedding of animal blood was not necessary to the remission of transgressions under the Mosaic law. But it should be observed that this regulation was merely an indulgence to circumstances of abject poverty; the *animal sacrifice prescribed* for the specified transgression being dispensed with, and an unbloody oblation admitted as a *substitute* for *that* sacrifice, which the poor Israelite had thus an opportunity of testifying his willingness to offer if it had been in his power. It will not be easy to find an instance which more strongly exemplifies the maxim, (exceptio firmat regulam) *the exception confirms the rule.* Every attentive reader of the Pentateuch must perceive it to have been a general and radical principle of the legal economy, *that without the shedding of blood there could be no remission; for that it was the blood which made atonement for the soul.* Nor could it with any plausibility be pretended, that, even in this case of partial exception, the remission of the offence was wholly irrespective of animal sacrifice; while the sacrifices appointed for the day of annual expiation were expressly declared "to "make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins, once a "year." *Levit.* xvi. 34.

* Num. v. 15.

wholly consumed upon the altar: of the meat offerings themselves, except when offered by a priest, or accompanied by a drink offering of wine, some portion was to be given to the priests; but those which were offered by the priests themselves were to be wholly consumed upon the altar.*

The meat offerings which were not commanded by the divine law, but were the votive or voluntary oblations of individuals, were of five kinds. The first consisted of *fine flour unbaked.* The second was *baked in a pan,* or *on a flat plate.* The third was *baked in a frying pan.*† Of these, the former was made thicker that it might not run over, and the latter was more liquid.‡ The fourth was *baked in an oven.* All these were thoroughly mingled with oil:§ but the fifth was *a thin cake like a wafer,* and was to be anointed with oil, but not mingled with it. The four last sorts now described, the Jews say,‖ used to be made so as for each offering to be divided into ten small cakes.

IX. These observations may suffice on the various sorts of meat offerings among the Jews. Whether offered for the whole congregation, or for particular persons, they were all made of wheaten flour, except the omer of first fruits, and the meat offering of jealousy; these two were made of barley meal. Those which were made of wheaten flour were not only to be brought to the altar, but also to be *heaved* or elevated towards God, and, as the Jews tell us, to be *waved* on every side towards him. Moreover, to the shew bread was added frankincense, but not oil; to the meat offerings accompanied by a drink offering of wine, was added oil, but no frankincense: to all the

* Levit. vi. 23. † Levit. ii. 1. 5. 7. ‡ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 13.
§ Levit. ii. 4. ‖ Maimon. *ibid.*

others, except the omer of first fruits, the meat offering of the sinner, and the meat offering of jealousy, were added both frankincense and oil; and to these three, neither oil nor frankincense. The law likewise contained an express prohibition; that no meat offering should be made with leaven, for that no leaven or honey should be added to any offerings that were to be burnt upon the altar.* This is supposed by some persons to have inculcated abstinence from excessive pleasures, and putting off all wickedness and pride.† This prohibition is extended by the Jews to figs and dates. But with all the meat offerings duly presented, salt was to be used,‡ and, according to the Jews, was to be sprinkled on the offerings when laid upon the altar. Salt possesses an agreeable savour, and the quality of preserving food from putrefaction: hence it is that a durable covenant is called "*a covenant of salt.*"§

X. Thus far we have followed the accounts of the Jews, in enumerating the offerings comprehended in the class generally denominated *mincha.* For this appellation they never give to the first fruits which each individual was commanded to bring to the temple every year.‖ But whatever opinion we may form of the word *mincha,* it is clear that those first fruits might justly be called oblations or meat offerings, as they were to be "*set before the altar,*"¶ by which ceremony they were offered to God;** and, if any credit be given to the Jews,†† were to be waved on every side towards him. Nor ought it to be objected, that none of those first fruits were to be burnt on the

* Levit. ii. 11. † I Corinth. v. 8. ‡ Levit. ii. 13.
§ Num. xviii. 19. II Chron. xiii. 5. ‖ Deut. xxvi. 2. ¶ Deut. xxvi. 4.
** Levit. ii. 12. †† R. Sol. Jarchi & Abarb. ad Deut. xxvi.

altar; for of the shew bread and the two loaves offered at Pentecost (both which the Jews themselves are accustomed to place in the number of their meat offerings) no part was ever to be burnt on the altar; but, like the first fruits, they were to be given wholly to the priests.

Respecting these first fruits the Jews commonly give the following account:* first, that by the command of the law they were only to be presented from Canaan, but that it was provided by a decree of the wise men, that they should also be brought from Syria, and the country of Og and Sihon: secondly, that the various kinds of corn and fruits which might happen to be put into the same basket, were not to be confounded together, but were to be separated from each other by some thing placed between them: thirdly, that it was not lawful for any first fruits to be brought to the altar, except of seven kinds of corn and fruits, wheat, barley, grapes, figs, apples, pomegranates and dates; productions for which Canaan is said to have been particularly famous;† fourthly, that no first fruits ought to be offered before the Pentecost, or after the feast of dedication; fifthly, that no certain portion of corn or fruits was prescribed by the law, but that it was the decision of the wisemen that at least a sixtieth part should thus be consecrated to God: sixthly, that the following things were also required; first, that immediately on arriving at the mountain of the house, every individual, even the king himself, should carry his first fruits on his shoulders; secondly, that he should always place his first fruits on some vessel; thirdly, that after having entered the mountain of the house, still bearing the basket on his

* Abarb. ad Deut. xxvi. Maimon. in Biccurim, c. 2. 3. † Deut. viii. 8.

shoulders, he should make this address to the priest; "I profess this day unto the Lord thy God, that I "am come unto the country, which the Lord sware "unto our fathers for to give it;* that after this, the basket being delivered to the priest, and with both their hands waved on every side, he should make this confession before God: "A Syrian ready to perish "was my father, &c."† fourthly, that every one should accompany his first fruits with burnt offerings and peace offerings; fifthly, that when the first fruits were brought into the sanctuary, the Levites should sing the thirtieth psalm; sixthly, that the basket of first fruits, as we have already suggested in passing, should be waved on every side before God; lastly, that he who brought an offering of first fruits should pass the night in Jerusalem. These are the accounts of the Jews respecting this kind of first fruits, which, because they were to be brought to the altar, may certainly be considered as meat offerings. But the tenths of the tithes,‡ the cake to be selected from every mass of dough,§ and those first fruits which the Jews call *the great offering*, notwithstanding they were to be given to the priests, yet wanted the characteristic of meat offerings, because they were not required to be brought to the altar.

XI. These statements must be followed by a brief notice of the oblations of incense that used to be made in the temple; for, though they are not usually numbered among the meat offerings, yet they must be classed with those sacrifices which were to be selected from inanimate things, and were to be solemnly burnt in the service of God. And they are so much the more deserving of explication, be-

* Deut. xxvi. 3. † Ibid. 5—8. ‡ Num. xviii. 26—28. § Num. xv. 20, 21.

cause, as they represented the prayers of the people, so the priest, presenting them to God in the temple, prefigured Christ now in the heavenly sanctuary commending to God the prayers of the saints. The sacred perfume, therefore, composed of various sweet spices,* was to be burnt in the inner sanctuary once every year,† and in the outer sanctuary twice every day, once in the morning and once in the evening.‡

The daily incense is said by the Jews § to have employed three priests. To the first was assigned the task of collecting into a golden vessel the ashes of the golden altar, on which the law commanded the daily incense to be offered. A second was appointed to fetch burning coals from the altar of sacrifice, to place them in a pan, and lay them on the golden altar. When those two were gone out of the temple, the third (now standing by the altar) waited till a signal given by the president standing without, and then with his hand took the incense from the censer, and laid it on the fire upon the altar: after having done this he also went out of the temple, but before his departure bowed his body towards the holy of holies with the greatest reverence in adoration of the Divine majesty; a ceremony that is also said to have been required of all other persons about to leave that sacred edifice. While the priest was burning the incense, the people also used to offer their prayers, each standing in his place.‖ For, as the sacred perfumes were emblematical of the devotions of the people, so that the priest in burning the incense be-

* Of these the written law enumerates four kinds; but the Jews say, that according to a tradition of Moses at Mount Sinai, there were to be eleven kinds. *Exod.* xxx. 34. *Maimon. Chele Mikdash*, c. 2.

† Levit. xvi. ‡ Exod. xxx. 7. 8.

§ Maimon. in Temidin Umos. c. 7. Misna in Tamid. c. 5. ‖ Luke i. 10.

fore God might be considered as presenting their prayers to him by a symbolical rite, it was proper that both services should be performed at the same time. And as it was right to mention this in passing, so it ought not to be omitted, that the sacred perfume regularly burnt every day was of the weight of one hundred denarii.* Thus the wise men thought proper to fix what had been left undetermined in the law.

But the spices with which the inner sanctuary of the temple was to be perfumed once every year, were burnt by the high priest himself on the day of atonement; when, according to the accounts of the Jews, he entered into the holy of holies, holding in his left hand a censer filled with a handful of incense, and in his right hand a pan filled with burning coals. After his entrance, having put the pan out of his hand, he laid the incense upon the coals, and the sanctuary being filled with a thick cloud, he immediately walked backwards by gentle steps towards the outer sanctuary; and as soon as he had reached it, he commended the people to God in the following prayer: 'May it please thee, O Lord God, that if 'this year be hot, it may also be rainy; that the 'sceptre may not depart from the family of Judah; 'that thy people Israel may not want food; and that 'the prayers of the impious may be vain.' After this short prayer, they say that he immediately went out of the temple, to preclude all suspicion among the people of any error in the divine services;† for that it sometimes happened, that, in consequence of a violation of the rites instituted by the command of God, the high priest died in the temple; which the Jews call *death by the hand of God.*

* Maimon. in Temidin Umos. c. 3. † Luke i. 21.

XII. Here it is unnecessary to remark, that whatever meat offerings and incense were consecrated by the Hebrews to the Creator of all things, similar offerings used to be made by other nations to their fictitious deities. There was this difference; that while the most particular selection was prescribed to the Hebrews in these things, the heathens in their oblations used no selection at all. Green herbs, flowers, and leaves; garlic, onions, and poppy; apples, nuts, and acorns: almost all kinds of fruits, with honey, milk, and water, were they in habit of offering to their deities.* It was also customary with the Hebrews, in celebrating the feast of tabernacles, to pour out a drink offering of water; but this was not commanded in the law.

* Porphyr. de Abstin. L. ii. s. 5, 6, 7, &c. Saubert. de Sacrif. c. 24, 25.

CHAPTER IX.

The Selection of Victims practised among the Jews.

SO great was the rage for sacrificing among heathen nations, and so little the selection of victims in some countries, that scarcely any species of animals can be named, however base or savage, that was not somewhere offered in sacrifice.* But the practice of the Israelites was very different. Among them it was provided by the divine law, that no species of animals should be used for sacrifices, except such as were chosen from bullocks, goats, sheep, turtle doves, or pigeons. These were species the most distinguished for gentleness; they most abounded in Canaan; and were principally in use for common food: and besides, it was a received opinion among some nations at least, that some of these animals were proper objects of religious worship, but that they could not be slain without incurring the greatest guilt. Whoever will consider these things, may easily discover the reason why all those species of animals which have been mentioned, and no others, were permitted to be used for sacrifices by the people admitted into the holy covenant. To this purpose are the following passages from Philo.† 'Of the animals used 'for sacrifices, some are inhabitants of the earth, and 'others of the air. Passing by numerous species of 'birds, God hath chosen two out of them all; be'cause of those which are naturally mild and grega'rious the pigeon is the mildest; and the turtle dove 'is the mildest of those which are naturally solitary: 'and of animals, passing by unnamed species, which

* Saubert. de Sacrif. c. 24. † De Animal. ad Sacrif. adhibitis

'it would not be easy to enumerate, he has given the 'exclusive preference to three, bullocks and sheep 'and goats, for they are the most gentle and tract-'able.' And a little after, speaking of bullocks, sheep, and goats, he says: 'Moreover, of all ani-'mals these are the most useful for the purposes of 'human life: the sheep to furnish cloathing, the 'most necessary covering of the body; bullocks to 'plough the land, and make preparation for sowing 'the seed, and to thresh the grain in order to con-'vert it into food: and the hair and skins of goats, 'woven and sewn together, have been formed into 'tents for travellers, and especially for soldiers, 'whom necessity frequently obliges to live in the 'open field.'

Maimonides* likewise observes, that some nations were so deeply sunk in the most shameful ignorance, that they considered some of the animals which have been mentioned as deserving of divine homage; and deemed putting them to death the worst of crimes. Wherefore, in order that this blind superstition might at length be entirely abolished, it was appointed by the sovereign counsel of God, that the slaughter of those very animals, which it was supposed could never be slain without great sin, should be an atonement for sins. 'The law, according to the explica-'tion of Onkelos, teaches that the Egyptians worship-'ped the constellation of Aries or the Ram, and on 'that account enacted, that no one should sacrifice a 'sheep, and held shepherds in the greatest abhor-'rence. Hence the language of Moses; "We shall 'sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians." Move-'over some sects of the Zabii worshipped demons,

* Moreh Nevoch. P. iii, c. 45.

'whom they supposed to have the form of goats, and 'whom therefore called by that name. This was an 'opinion very widely diffused, and hence that pas-'sage in Leviticus; "they shall no more offer their 'sacrifices unto demons, after whom they have gone 'a whoring." Wherefore these sects also prohibited 'goats from being eaten. The sacrificing of bullocks 'was regarded with aversion by far the greatest num-'ber of those who were addicted to strange worship, 'and they all held that species of animals in the 'highest honour; so that in India, even to the pre-'sent day, you may find some people who never 'sacrifice bullocks, not even in those places where 'they sacrifice other animals. That the memory of 'these false opinions might be utterly obliterated, 'therefore, it was commanded in the law, that we 'should sacrifice only three species of animals. For 'this was the decree of God: "ye shall bring your 'offering of the herd and of the flock:" so that by 'an act which was supposed to involve a most 'enormous sin, by that very act access to God was to 'be obtained, and sins were to be expiated. Thus 'corrupt opinions, which are the diseases of the hu-'man mind, are generally cured by things manifestly 'contrary to them.' A little after he proceeds: 'To 'the reason which we have already stated, why only 'these three species of animals were used for sacri-'fices, may be added another; that these three spe-'cies were in the greatest abundance, whereas there 'was but a small number of lions, bears, and other 'wild beasts; which, it is said, used to be immolated 'by idolaters. But, as there were many persons who 'had no quadruped to sacrifice, it was commanded 'by God that sacrifices should likewise be selected

'from birds, and of those sorts which were most 'numerous in the land of Israel, as well as the most 'beautiful and most easily caught; such as turtle 'doves and young pigeons.

II. But as of this kind of victims, so of all animals used for sacrifices, the greatest selection was to be made. For nothing "blind, or broken, or maim-"ed, or having a wen, or scurvy, or scabbed," nor "that which" was "bruised, or crushed, or broken, or "cut," could lawfully be brought to the altar.* Either a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, with any disproportion in its members, whether of excess or of defect, it was lawful, I apprehend, to "offer for a freewill "offering, but not for a vow:" though this law is differently expounded by the Jews; who maintain that such animals could not lawfully be brought to the altar, but might be solemnly consecrated to remove the impurities of the temple.† The Jews also conclude, that the list of blemishes just mentioned is not an enumeration of all the blemishes; but merely a specimen of them: wherefore they add many others, any one of which they suppose to have polluted a victim, as much as those which have just been specified.‡ Therefore every animal, before it was brought to the altar, used to be diligently examined. It must also be added, that no animal procured either by the price of a dog, or by whoredom, could be offered to God;§ it being impossible that there should be any value in sacrifices acquired by such base means.

III. And not only the Jews, but some of the hea-

* Levit. xxii. 22. 24. † R. Sol. Jarchi, ad Levit xxii. 23.
‡ Maimon. in Isure Misbeach, c. 2. & in Biath Hamikdash, c. 7.
§ Deut. xxiii. 18.

then nations also, employed very diligent caution that there should be no blemish in their victims. The Greeks, as we learn from Porphyry,* sacrificed no animals that were mutilated, nor such as were distinguished by any remarkable blemish. This is asserted by the Scholiast on Aristophanes:† 'Animals which have been deprived of their tails are not 'slain in sacrifice; nor is any thing that is not perfect ever sacrificed to the gods.' The existence of a similar custom among other people is evident from the following passage of Virgil. 'They slay sheep 'chosen according to custom:'‡ on which Servius comments; 'The word *chosen* is particularly significant; for it was customary to choose for sacrifices 'sheep that had no defect.' Take another passage from the same poet: 'Now it will be best to sacrifice seven bullocks from the untamed herd, and the 'same number of sheep, chosen according to custom.'§ The words *chosen according to custom*, the same commentator says, refer to 'an ancient custom, 'which the poet has passed over as universally known, 'that no victim should have a sharp tail, a cloven 'tongue, or a black ear.' Hence it appears that some examination of victims was customary among the heathens. It is thus alluded to by Lucian:‖ 'They 'crown the animal with garlands, and, having first 'carefully examined whether it is perfect, that they 'may not immolate those which are improper, they 'bring it to the altar, and slay it in the presence of 'the god.'

IV. Of those animals which were destined for the altar, the age also was to be taken into the account.

* De Abstin. L. ii. s. 23. † Ad Acharnenses. ‡ Æneid iv. 57.
§ Æneid vi. 38. ‖ De Sacrif.

The Jews tell us,* that they were allowed to sacrifice,—of turtle doves, only such as were full grown, which were the most valuable; of pigeons, only young ones, as being preferable to those that were older; and of young quadrupeds, only such as had reached their eighth day:† for no young cattle were considered as perfect in their kind before that time. This is the representation of Maimonides: 'God enjoined 'that no victim should be sacrificed to him, which 'was not full seven days old: what is under that age, 'is imperfect in its kind, and is despised as a sort of 'abortion.' Some suppose this to have been the reason why male children were not to be circumcised and introduced into the holy covenant, till they were eight days old.‡ But though young cattle might lawfully be sacrificed at that age, yet in all the sacrifices, except the firstlings, the passover, and the tithes, it was accounted more laudable, to immolate no quadruped that was less than thirty days old.

V. Not very dissimilar sentiments respecting the age of victims appear to have prevailed among other nations. Pliny says: 'A young swine is pure for 'sacrifice on the fifth day, a sheep on the eighth, 'a bullock on the thirtieth.'§ Varro gives a different account about young swine; which, he says, 'are 'not considered pure, or fit for sacrifice, till they are 'ten days old.'‖

VI. Among the Jews, as the sacrifice of any animal just after its production was altogether unlawful, so old cattle were accounted unsuitable for the altar. Hence it was not customary to select vic-

* Maimon. in Isure Misbeach, c. 3. and Moreh Nevoch. P. iii. c. 46.
† Levit. xxii. 27. ‡ Abarb. ad Levit. xxii. 7. § Hist. Nat. L. viii. c. 5.
‖ De Re Rustica, L. ii. c. 4.

tims from sheep or goats, that had passed their second year, or from bullocks that had passed their third year. It must be understood, however, that cattle of four or five years old were considered, not as absolutely inadmissible, but only as less suitable. Thus the author of the book Siphra: 'Animals of four or 'five years old may lawfully be used for sacrifices, 'but from motives of honour they offer not those that 'are old.'*

VII. In sacrificing birds no selection of sex was enjoined. But the victims chosen from cattle consisted sometimes of males, sometimes of females, and sometimes of both, according to the nature of the sacrifices, and the circumstances of the offerers. The peace offerings of individuals, whether immediately voluntary, or offered in consequence of vows, were both males and females: the victims offered for the whole congregation, to whatever class of sacrifices they belonged; all the burnt offerings whether for the whole congregation, or for particular persons; all trespass offerings, and all sin offerings for a ruler, or high priest, were to be males: but the sin offering of a private individual was required to be a female lamb or kid.†

* Here it may be proper to mention the senses in which the Jews assert the following terms to be used in the scriptures: כבש a lamb one year old, איל a ram two years old, אגל a calf one year old, פר a bullock two years old, שעיר עזים a goat two years old, שעיר a goat more than one year old, [illegible] less than two. *Maimon. in Maase Korban.* c. 1.

† Levit. iv.

CHAPTER X.

Enumeration of all the Kinds of Victims appointed in the Law of Moses. Particular Account of the Burnt Offerings.

HAVING shewn what animals were to be used for sacrifice, according to the law of Moses, we proceed to the various kinds of victims appointed in that law. These are distinguished in the scriptures by the following appellations: *a burnt offering, a peace offering, a sin offering*, and *a trespass offering*. The class of peace offerings includes three sorts, the *votive, voluntary*, and *eucharistic:* to which must also be added, those others which may be referred to the eucharistic, and which are generally so called by the Jews; the *festive and rejoicing peace offerings, the ram of the Nazarite, the paschal lamb, the firstlings*, and *the tithes*. Of all these the most ancient were the holocausts or whole burnt offerings. The sacrifices of Abraham and Noah, were certainly of this kind; and there is the highest probability that Abel's were the same. The scriptures mention no other till long after the time of Abraham. But it is not to be doubted that peace offerings were in use before the law was given by Moses. This is evident from his address to Pharaoh: "Thou must give us "also sacrifices and burnt offerings,* that we may "sacrifice unto the Lord our God." To this add what is recorded of Jethro, that he "took a burnt "offering and sacrifices† for God." The word rendered *sacrifices* in these passages denotes *peace offerings:* an interpretation maintained by all the Jews,

* זבחים ועלת Exod. x. 25. † עלה וזבחים Exod. xviii. 12.

and sanctioned by the use of the word itself;—which, especially when mentioned in connection with *burnt offerings*, is never applied in the scriptures to any other kinds of victims than peace offerings. Whether piacular sacrifices, such as are described by Moses, were ever used before the law was given to the Jews, I would not undertake to decide. It is evident that these and other kinds of victims were prescribed by Moses, with such rites and ceremonies as were chiefly designed and adapted to make the Jewish sacrifices prefigure the sacrifice of Christ.

II. Every kind of sacrifices partook of the nature of divine worship. *Burnt offerings* were presented to God, as the maker, preserver, and sovereign of the universe, entitled to all worship and honour. *Peace offerings* were presented to him, as the giver of all blessings; whether already received, or not yet received, but only desired and prayed for, and that either with or without the intervention of a vow: in the first case the offering was *eucharistic;* in the second, *votive;* and in the third, *voluntary*, proceeding from the mere free will of the individual. Though burnt offerings were likewise offered from voluntary choice, and in consequence of vows, yet the original terms which we have rendered *eucharistic*, *votive*, and *voluntary*, are generally applied in the scriptures exclusively to peace offerings. *Piacular sacrifices*, both *sin offerings* and *trespass offerings*, were presented to God, in the character of a judge, offended by sins, and having power to punish or to pardon. Hence it appears that sacrifices were directed to the same end, as prayers and thanksgivings uttered by the lips; only with this difference, that the same intention was expressed by different signs, in the

latter by articulate sounds, in the former by significant rites.

III. Let it be observed, that, as the natural worship of God consists, either in supplicating his favour, or in commemorating his favour and celebrating his praise; so these were clearly the objects contemplated in all sacrifices. And holocausts, or whole burnt offerings, were offered with both these views. This twofold design is evident from the primitive use of them. In the early ages of the world, when no other sacrifices were offered but whole burnt offerings, this one kind of sacrifice was both petitionary and eucharistic, and was applied to every part of natural worship, according to the intention of each individual. This might be done with the greater propriety, because in every kind of worship God ought to be regarded as the maker, preserver, and sovereign of the universe. But other sacrifices were less extensive in their application. The eucharistic were not offered, except to celebrate God's praise, and to commemorate his favour; nor the piacular, votive, or voluntary, but with a view to supplicate and obtain that favour. The piacular sacrifices, indeed, both sin offerings and trespass offerings, were offered in order to obtain the pardon of sins, which is an eminent exhibition of divine favour; but the votive and voluntary, in order to conciliate that favour, which is displayed in averting dangers, and in continuing or increasing prosperity. Almost all votive offerings had respect to the former of these objects; and the free will offerings, to both.

IV. From this brief account of all the kinds of victims, and of their design and efficacy, we proceed to the remaining branches of this subject in the fol-

lowing order: we shall treat, first, of the sacrifices of individuals; secondly, of the paschal sacrifice, enjoined on each family, or small neighbourhood; and lastly of the sacrifices appointed for the whole nation.

Sacrifices of every class, except the paschal lamb, were frequently offered for individuals; burnt offerings, and piacular offerings, and peace offerings; and likewise all the kinds both of piacular and of peace offerings.

V. The original term for a *burnt offering* is derived from a root which signifies *to ascend.** It is so called, because it was laid whole on the altar, and there being consumed by fire, the greatest part went upwards. Hence the subtleties of Abarbinel, who considers the burnt offering as symbolical of the ascent of the mind towards heaven: 'The design of the 'burnt offering is, to teach the intelligent soul to unite, 'itself to its Creator.'† Hence he represents piacular sacrifices as far inferior to burnt offerings. But, dismissing vain conjectures, the principal thing to be remembered is what we have already observed; that burnt offerings were anciently applied to every part of natural worship, to thanks for benefits received, to deprecation of evil, and supplication of good. All this is clearly deducible from the sacred history. Noah offered burnt offerings as an expression of gratitude to God, for the preservation of himself and his family when all the rest of mankind had perished in the deluge.‡ Job added burnt offerings to prayers, when he interceded for forgiveness for his sons and his friends.§ Balaam, following beyond all doubt the general custom, directed burnt offerings to be prepared when he was about to pray for safety to

* עלה † Præf. ad Levit. ‡ Gen. viii. 20. § Job i. 5. xlii. 8.

Balak, and destruction to the Israelites.* These facts justify the conclusion, that those who lived before the time of Moses, or were unacquainted with his law, sometimes connected burnt offerings with every part of divine worship.

VI. Nor was the use of victims of this kind less extensive among the Jews after the giving of the law. For the Jews were in the habit of offering them, both in compliance with express injunctions of the law, and as votive and voluntary oblations on any occasion they chose. The law required them of a Nazarite when defiled by a dead body, and when discharged from a vow by having fulfilled it;†—of persons who were to be cleansed from the leprosy,‡ and other specified pollutions;§—of women after childbirth;‖—of the high priest on the day of atonement;¶—and of all adult Israelites on the three great festivals, of passover, pentecost, and tabernacles, at which every individual used to appear before God in the sanctuary.** The burnt offerings presented at these solemnities, being considered as causing every individual to appear before God with greater acceptance, have been called by the Jews *holocausts of appearance.*††—That burnt offerings used also to be presented as votive and voluntary oblations, may be concluded from the language of David: "I will go "into thy house with burnt offerings; I will pay "thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my "mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble. I will "offer unto thee burnt sacrifices of fatlings, with the "incense of rams; I will offer bullocks with goats."‡‡

* Num. xxiii. † Num. vi. 11. 14. ‡ Levit. xiv. 19, 20.
§ Levit. xv. 15. 30. ‖ Levit. xii. 8. ¶ Levit. xvi. 24.
** Deut. xvi. 16. †† Maimon. Præf. ad Cod. Zebach. Abarb. Præf. ad Levit. ‡‡ Psalm lxvi. 13—15.

"Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion; build "thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou "be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, "with burnt offering and whole burnt offering: then "shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar."* The former of these passages I understand to intend votive offerings; and the latter, voluntary ones.

VII. As burnt offerings are said in the scriptures to "make atonement"† for those by whom they were offered, hence the Jews consider this class of victims as expiating certain kinds of sins. Such, they apprehend, were evil thoughts and designs,‡ violations of affirmative § precepts, and transgressions of negative precepts, which were so implicated with affirmative ones, that a breach of the negative was altogether incompatible with obedience to the affirmative. ‖ Of this description was the prohibition of killing the dam with the young, which could not be violated without disobeying the injunction to let the dam go free. The Jews are the more confirmed in considering these kinds of sins as expiated by burnt offerings, because their expiation is never attributed to the victims exclusively piacular, either sin offerings or trespass offerings. But here it is important to guard this statement from being misunderstood: it maintains, not that burnt offerings were in all cases to expiate all evil thoughts, and all omissions of duties enjoined

* Psalm li. 18, 19. † כפר Levit. xiv.

‡ Jonath. Paraph. ad Levit. vi. 9. Abarb. & David de Pomis in voc. עלה

§ TR.—The rabbies have distributed the whole of the Mosaic law into six hundred and thirteen precepts; which they divide into two classes, *affirmative* or commanding, and *negative* or prohibitory. The affirmative, they say, are two hundred and forty eight; and the negative, three hundred and sixty-five.

‖ Sol. Jarchi ad Levit. i. 4. Sol. Ben Melech, ibid.

by the law, sins for which indeed no flocks or herds would be sufficient to atone; but that a person who came to pray for the pardon of such sins, might, if he chose, legitimately accompany his prayers with burnt offerings, and that these offerings would promote the acceptance of his prayers. This idea is fully implied in the Hebrew word rendered *to make atonement*,* whenever it is used in reference to burnt offerings, or peace offerings, or acts rightly performed to a neighbour; of all which uses of the word examples are found in the scriptures.

VIII. The Jews believe it to have been peculiar to burnt offerings, that they might lawfully be offered at the temple of Jerusalem by strangers as well as by Israelites. This they contend was not the case with other sacrifices, none of which could be accepted by the Jewish priests from any Gentiles: not piacular victims, properly so called, whether sin offerings or trespass offerings, because the laws respecting them were given to the Jews only, and not to other nations;—nor peace offerings which used to be offered at the solemn festivals, because strangers had no concern in the festivals prescribed to the Israelites; nor lastly to the votive or voluntary peace offerings, because the meat offering that was always to be connected with these oblations, was never, they allege, to be accepted from strangers.† Whence it became customary, that if any piacular victims were brought to the temple by Gentiles, they were slain and consumed with the ceremonies peculiar to burnt offerings: nevertheless, if any stranger was desirous of furnishing sacrifices for the peace and happiness of the people of Israel,

* כפר † Levit. xxii. 25.

it was deemed lawful to offer such victims after the manner of peace offerings.*

IX. Nor were burnt offerings confined to the Hebrews and other worshippers of one God; they were every where in use among idolaters. Herodotus mentions an instance:† 'At this time Eumilcas 'sacrificed and made expiation, consuming whole 'bodies on a large flaming pile.'‡ The same practice is introduced by Seneca: § 'He burns 'entire animals:' which are holocausts. Evidence of this custom is also supplied by Virgil; 'And he lays 'upon the flames (*solida viscera*) the entire carcasses 'of bulls.'‖ Servius explains '*solida viscera*' to 'mean 'not the entrails but the flesh, all that is between the 'bones and the skin. This phrase denotes a holo-'caust, which, after the entrails had been extracted, 'was laid upon the altar.' The same commentator, on another passage, says; 'These animals are vic-'tims which are only immolated, and the flesh is 'allotted to the priests. In one place the poet sig-'nifies that only the blood was poured upon the 'altars;¶ in another place, he mentions a sacrifice, 'consisting of a part of the body:** and in another 'place' (just quoted) 'he describes the consumption 'of entire victims.'—But holocausts which the law of of Moses required to be sacrificed to the one Maker and Lord of the universe, the disposer of life and death, used to be immolated by the heathens to their fictitious and all-devouring infernal deities.

* Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 3. † In Polymnia.

‡ TR.—A remarkable instance occurs in Xenophon: 'When they 'were come to the sacred place, they offered sacrifices to Jupiter, and '(ωλοκαυτωσαν) burnt whole bulls; then to the Sun, and burnt 'whole horses. *Cyropæd.* L. viii.

§ In Oedipode. ‖ Æneid. vi. 253. ¶ Æneid. iii. 65. ** Æneid. v. 237.

CHAPTER XI.

The Peace Offerings, and those which may be classed with Peace Offerings, such as the Firstlings and the Tithes.

THE Hebrew word rendered Peace Offerings* comes from a root,† which signifies either *retribution* or *peace;* and the term *peace* in the scriptures generally denotes, either *the mutual concord of friends*, or a state of *prosperity*. These different senses assigned to the root have produced different expositions of the appellation derived from it. By those who understand the root to mean *retribution* or *recompence*, the name given to this class of sacrifices is considered as indicating the division made of them into three parts, for God, for the offerers, and for the priests. This opinion is maintained by the author of the book *Siphra*; who says, 'they were so called, because a 'prescribed portion of them fell to the share of each 'party.' Those who understand the root to mean *concord*, think the name of these oblations to denote their being *symbols of friendship* between God, the priests, and the offerers; to each of whom was allotted a certain portion of them:—the blood and inwards to God, the breast and shoulder to the priests, the rest of the carcass and the skin to the offerers. 'The '*peace offerings* were so called, because they used to 'be offered, when any one was in favour with God, 'and their design was that the offerers, the priests, 'and God, to whom be praise, might use one com-'mon table. For the blood and inwards were assigned 'to the altar, the breast and shoulder to the priests,

* שלמים † שלם

and the skin and flesh to the offerers.' With this representation of R. Levi Ben Gerson, agree R. Solomon Jarchi, David Kimchi, and the author of the book entitled *Aruch;* who all consider the common table to have been an indication of friendship, and those who fed upon the sacrifices, as having used one common table with God. But though this account of the matter may not be inconsistent with the truth, yet I prefer, as more simple and natural, the opinion of those, who, understanding the root to signify *prosperity*, conclude this class of sacrifices to have been so called, because they were always offered in reference to a prosperous state of affairs, either obtained, or prayed for. This explanation appears to have been adopted by the Septuagint translators,* and by Philo;† who designate these sacrifices by a Greek term‡ which denotes their being offered on account of *safety*, or *prosperity*. And as sacrifices of this class received the original appellation, which is rendered *peace offerings*, from their being offered in thanksgiving or supplication for *prosperity;* so, because they were employed by the offerers themselves in sacred feasts, they were also very frequently designated by another name,§ which denotes their being *victims slain for banquets*. While the people were in the wilderness, living in the vicinity of the sanctuary, *such* banquets were always to be celebrated whenever any animal fit for sacrifice was slain: for the blood of every bullock, sheep, and goat, slaughtered there, was to be poured out, and its fat to be burnt, upon the altar:‖ so that in the wilderness, it

* In Exod. xx. 24. Num. x. 10. xxix. 39.

† Περὶ Ζωων εἰς Θυσ. ‡ Σωτηρια. § זבחים

‖ Levit. xvii. 3—6.

is evident, no Israelite was to taste the flesh of any animal of either of these species, unless it had been immolated at the altar. This law ceased on the settlement in Canaan, when the people were dispersed in various places remote from the sanctuary: then every individual was permitted to kill any cattle within his own gates, and to use the flesh for common food.*

II. Of peace offerings the scripture, as we have already stated, mentions three kinds; *voluntary*, *votive*, and *eucharistic*.† The latter was ~~three former were~~ offered on account of prosperity already enjoyed, the two last in reference to prosperity desired and implored. Hence Abarbinel calls eucharistic sacrifices 'praise 'for good received;' and votive and voluntary ones, 'prayers for good not yet obtained.'‡ The same idea is conveyed by this author in another place: 'After eucharistic offerings, the scripture mentions 'votive and voluntary sacrifices, which were offered 'up as vows and prayers in order to obtain pros-'perity.'§ Indeed it was the opinion of the patriarchs before the law was given from Sinai, that the divine favour exhibited in the bestowment of prosperity could not be more suitably commemorated, or more easily obtained, than by offering to God some portion of the good things received from him. This sentiment appears to have given rise to the peace offerings (to say nothing of the burnt offerings) which used to be offered before the law was delivered to the Jews. The same sentiment prevailed among the heathens, who thought it unlawful to sit down to meals without oblations of bread and wine, being made to

* Deut. xii. 15.
† Levit. vii. 11, 12. 16.
‡ In Præf. ad Levit.
§ Ad Levit. vii.

their deities: which the book of Daniel shews to have been the ancient custom of Chaldea.*

III. But though both votive and voluntary sacrices were offered in order to obtain prosperity, yet there was a distinction between them, which gave rise to their different appellations. A person who made a vow is represented as expressing himself to the following purpose: 'I solemnly engage to devote to 'God a peace offering, or a meat offering, or the 'value of this animal or flour:'—whereas he who presented a voluntary oblation is affirmed to have expressed himself thus: 'I will present to God this 'peace offering, or this meat offering.' On this subject Maimonides says:† 'What is a votive sacrifice? 'and what is a voluntary one? If any person has 'said,—I solemnly bind myself to present to God a 'burnt offering, a peace offering, a meat offering; or 'the price of this animal for a burnt offering or peace 'offering;—this is a vow. But if he has said,—I 'will present to God this animal or the price of this 'animal, as a burnt offering or peace offering; or, 'this tenth of an ephah for a meat offering; this is a 'voluntary sacrifice.' And in another place:‡ He 'who says, *I solemnly engage*, makes a vow. Who-'ever says, THIS *shall be sacrificed to God*, makes a 'voluntary oblation.' Not very different is the account of Abarbinel:§ 'A votive sacrifice is a sacrifice 'promised *generally*, as if any one has said, I so-'lemnly engage that I will present to God a burnt 'offering or a peace offering. But when a person 'fixes his eyes on one particular animal, and laying 'his hand upon it, says, I will offer this animal as a 'burnt offering, or as a peace offering; that is a vo-

* Dan. i. 8. † In Maase Korban. c. 14. ‡ Nedarim, c. 1. § Præf. ad Levit.

'luntary sacrifice.'—Hence if an animal devoted to be a voluntary sacrifice should happen to die, the person who had declared his intention to offer it would be instantly released from the obligation, without the sacrifice of any victim in its stead. But the case of a vow was very different: nor could any one ever be discharged from a vow that he had made, but by the sacrifice of such a victim as he had vowed.* Voluntary sacrifices, moreover, would frequently be offered by those who were not threatened by any dangers. But vows, whether of burnt offerings or peace offerings, would chiefly be made by persons in imminent danger: as Jephthah on going to battle against the Ammonites,† Jonah in the belly of the fish,‡ and Absalom in exile.§ This is confirmed by the language of David already quoted: "I will pay "thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my "mouth hath spoken when I was in trouble."‖ In another place he says: "Thy vows are upon me, O "God: I will render praises unto thee. For thou "hast delivered my soul from death."¶ From these instances it may fairly be concluded, that votive sacrifices were chiefly promised by persons who were in circumstances of danger.

IV. These two kinds of sacrifices, votive and voluntary, were in use likewise among other nations; among whom also they were principally offered by persons involved in dangers, or engaged in important and arduous enterprizes. Thus the mariners in the ship with the prophet Jonah, when they were assailed by a dreadful tempest, "offered a sacrifice, "and made vows.** Read the account of Cæsar

*'Abarb. Præf. ad Levit. † Judg. xi. 30, 31. ‡ Jonah ii. 9.
§ II Sam. xv. 7, 8. ‖ Psal. lxvi. 13, 14. ¶ Psal. lvi. 12, 13. ** Jonah i. 16.

concerning the ancient Gauls:* 'Those who are 'afflicted with grievous diseases, and those who are 'preparing for battles or apprehensive of dangers, 'either immolate human victims, or vow that they 'will immolate themselves.' From the Scholiast on Euripides it appears, that wars used to be preceded by sacrifices: 'Kings, when about to go to war, are 'accustomed to sacrifice to the gods.'† But sacrifices used also to be vowed by persons who were undertaking any arduous enterprizes. Thus when the Roman consuls were about to go to their provinces, it was the general custom for them to make public vows.‡ The form in which these vows were expressed was repeated by them after the chief priest, and is said to have been in the following terms: 'Which if 'thou grantest, O Jupiter, then we vow to sacrifice 'to thee a bullock decked with gold.' But whether the votive and voluntary sacrifices in use among the heathens were offered in the manner of peace offerings, or of burnt offerings, or, on different occasions, of both, it is not our purpose to inquire. We must now return to the Jews.

V. As votive and voluntary sacrifices were offered in order to obtain prosperity, so the eucharistic were acknowledgments of good received, especially by persons who had escaped and been delivered from great dangers, or had been favoured with signal benefits. This is plain from the language of David: "O Lord, "truly I am thy servant, I am thy servant, and the

* De Bello Gall. L. vi. c. 15. † In Orest.

‡ Cæsar de Bello Civili, L. i. c. 6.

TR.—It appears from Livy, that these vows used to be pronounced in the capitol. In his account of the war against Perseus, king of Macedon, this historian says: 'The consul Publius Licinius, having made vows in 'the capitol, marched out of the city, arrayed in the military robe.'

"son of thine handmaid: thou hast loosed my bonds. "I will offer to thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and "will call upon the name of the Lord."* Hence it was that Hezekiah, after having abolished all idolatrous rites and restored the ancient worship, directed eucharistic sacrifices to be offered.† Such, it is evident, were offered also by Manasseh after his restoration to his country and kingdom.‡ It would appear that every good man, whenever he was about to render solemn thanksgivings to God for deliverance vouchsafed to him, thought it right to give a further evidence of the gratitude of his heart by the immolation of eucharistic sacrifices. Such is the doctrine taught by the Jews concerning this kind of oblations. Aben Ezra says:§ "The design of an eucharistic 'sacrifice is, that every person delivered from trouble 'may give praise to God on account of it.' Solomon Jarchi:‖ 'An eucharistic sacrifice ought to be offered 'to God by every one who has experienced any 'thing like a miracle; who has sailed over the ocean, 'or travelled through deserts; who has been delivered 'from prison, or recovered from disease: for they 'are under the greatest obligations to praise God.' The same sentiment is inculcated by Abarbinel.¶

VI. But among the eucharistic sacrifices may likewise be numbered those other peace offerings enjoined in the law: *the ram of the Nazarite*, and *the sacrifices of festivity and rejoicing* prescribed for the grand festivals. For the Nazarite who had fulfilled his vow was commanded to offer a ram for an eucharistic sacrifice, on account of the punctual accomplishment of the vow:** wherefore that victim was to

* Psal. cxvi. 16, 17. † II Chron. xxix. 30. ‡ II Chron. xxxiii. 16.
§ Ad Levit. vii. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Ibid. ** Num. vi. 17.

be accompanied with unleavened bread, such as was required to be added to eucharistic sacrifices.*—The peace offerings also, which it was customary to offer at the solemn festivals, as well as the festivals themselves, were designed to commemorate the praises of God.† The Jews tell us, that bread was not to be added to the peace offerings at those festivals; as it was on all other occasions.

Among the eucharistic oblations may also be placed the sacrifices of the firstlings and the tithes. After the preservation of the first born in Israel, both man and beast, from the destruction which had fallen upon the Egyptians, God declared, that in memory of so great a benefit, every first born male should thenceforward be devoted to him.‡ All male firstlings of beasts fit for the altar, he commanded to be sacrificed:§ and all male children, the first born of their mothers, were to be redeemed by five shekels of money paid to the priests.‖ This law is considered by the Jews as having no reference to the tribe of Levi, because all the males of that tribe were constantly devoted to the service of the sanctuary. The firstling of an ass was to be redeemed by the substitution of a lamb, or, that no one might derive any benefit from the sacrilege, his neck was to be broken.¶ This law is said not to have extended to animals of other species, as horses or camels; of which the Israelites are supposed not to have had any during their servitude in Egypt. This, at least, was the opinion of Abarbinel:** 'Israel while in bondage in 'Egypt had no unclean animals, except asses: and

* Levit. vii. 12. † Deut. xvi. 2. 10, 11, 12. ‡ Num. iii. 13.
§ Exod. xiii. 15. Num. xviii. 17. ‖ Num. iii. 47.
¶ Exod. xiii. 13. ** In loc.

'therefore this was the only species, the firstlings of 'which were required to be redeemed.' Aben Ezra was of the same opinion: that no firstlings were required by the law to be redeemed, except of those species which God had consecrated to himself by preserving them from the pestilence of Egypt; that none were preserved from that pestilence, but those which belonged to the Hebrews; and that they then possessed no unclean animals of any other species than asses: wherefore to asses alone the command to "redeem the firstling of unclean beasts,"* is thought by the Jews to be exclusively applicable.

The flesh of every firstling brought to the altar was wholly allotted to the priests; to whom God says: "The firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a "sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not re-"deem; they are holy: thou shalt sprinkle their "blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for "an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto "the Lord. And the flesh of them shall be thine, "as the wave breast, and as the right shoulder are "thine.†" Hence it appears, that the command given in another place respecting the firstlings of the herd and the flock, "Thou shalt eat them before the "Lord thy God,"‡ is addressed, not to the proprietor of a herd or flock, but to the priest. But if any firstling happened to have a blemish, it was not to be brought to the altar as a sacrifice, but to be given to the priests; and it was allowed to be eaten any where, not only by the priests themselves, but also by any other persons.§

VII. To the same order of sacrifices must also be

* Num. xviii. 15. † Num. xviii. 17, 18. ‡ Deut. xv. 20.
§ Deut. xv. 21, 22.

referred those victims which were selected as the tithe of lambs, kids, and calves.* The tenth of the herd and of the flock was every year to be devoted to the Lord, as a kind of thank offering for all the advantages received from cattle. The mode of tithing practised among the Hebrews is thus described by Maimonides:† 'If any one has simply 'taken one out of ten, or ten out of a hundred lambs, 'this is by no means rendering the tithe. How then 'does he proceed? He shuts all his lambs, kids, or 'calves into one fold, with a gate so narrow that 'two cannot pass through it at once. Then he places 'the dams before the gate, that on hearing their 'bleating or lowing the young ones may come out to 'them. This is referred to in the clause, "Whatsoever passeth under the rod;" which intends that 'the young ones should go forth of their own accord, 'and not be drawn out by force. As they pass out, 'he counts them successively with a rod, thus: one, 'two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, and 'the tenth that passes, whether perfect or blemished, 'whether male or female, he marks with a red mark, 'and says, Let this be consecrated for the tithe.' The tenth that went forth, therefore, if it was fit for sacrifice, was to be solemnly offered to the Lord; if it happened to have any blemish, it might lawfully be eaten any where, but was not to be redeemed with money, nor to be exchanged for any other animal. But whatever was its condition, the whole of the flesh belonged to the proprietor of the flock or herd, and no part of it to the priests. Such, at least, is the opinion given by Maimonides:‡ 'The priests have 'no share in it; it belongs wholly to the offerers,

* Levit. xxvii. 32. † In Bechoroth, c. 7. ‡ In Bechoroth, c. 6.

'like the paschal lamb. But if it has any blemish, 'whether that blemish happened before or after its 'consecration as the tithe, it may lawfully be eaten 'any where.' Bartenora says:† 'It does not ap-'pear from the whole law, that any part of an 'animal consecrated as the tithe was given to the 'priests.' But these things belong to another place. We must now proceed to those sacrifices, which, because they were offered to expiate sins and obtain pardon, are commonly called expiatory or piacular.

* Ad Zebach. c. 5.

CHAPTER XII.

The Piacular Sacrifices called Sin Offerings.

THE Jews had two kinds of piacular sacrifices, prescribed in the law, and distinguished by appellations which we render *sin offering** and *trespass offering*:†—terms which, though not adequately expressing the force of the original words, we are obliged to retain for want of better. Of sin offerings, the Jews say there were two kinds, of which one was fixed the same for the rich and the poor, and the other was greater or less according to the various circumstances of the offerers. The former they call *the definite sin offering;* and the latter, *the ascending and descending sin offering.*

II. The definite sin offering is described by them as designed to expiate such sins committed through ignorance or imprudence against negative precepts, as when committed with knowledge were to be punished with death by the hand of God:—so that every sin which this kind of sacrifice is considered as appointed to expiate must have had these four characters. First, that it was against a negative precept; secondly, that it was committed without knowledge; thirdly, that it consisted in actions, and not merely in words, or thoughts; lastly, that it was such as if done with knowledge was to be punished with death. And that the first three of these characters were united in sins for which victims of this kind were to atone, they conclude from the express words of the law: "If a soul shall sin through ignorance against "any of the commandments of the Lord, concerning

* חטאת † אשם

"things which ought not to be done, and shall do "against any of them:—he shall bring his offering, a "young bullock,—a male kid,—a female kid,—or a "female lamb."* The omission of duties might for the most part be repaired by their punctual performance afterwards, which was considered in this case as preferable to sacrifices. And sins committed through imprudence in words and thoughts were too numerous for any flocks and herds to expiate them all; and therefore to every one who repented of them, they were forgiven without sacrifice. The last characteristic, that every sin to be expiated by this kind of victims was such as if committed with knowledge was to be punished with death, is considered by the Jews as placed beyond all doubt, by that passage where the appointment of this sort of sacrifice to atone for the guilt of persons sinning through ignorance, is immediately followed by a denunciation of death against all who should sin presumptuously.† Hence they conclude, that all sins to be expiated by these victims were of that kind which when perpetrated with knowledge were to be followed by excision. But the term *presumptuous* indicates no particular kind of sin, but a certain mode of sinning, which consists in despising God's commands, and throwing contempt upon his laws by transgression of any kind whatever. I should therefore think it probable, that what is called the definite sin offering was to expiate all offences against negative precepts committed through ignorance or incaution, except those which were expiated either by other sacrifices, respecting which we shall inquire hereafter, or by any other means. To this class I refer involuntary homicide, which was to

* Levit. iv. 2, 3. 14. 23. 28. 32. † Num. xv. 27—30.

be expiated, not by sacrifice, but by exile:* and offences in common life, undesignedly committed against a neighbour, and not denied by perjury; which were forgiven without sacrifice, on a compensation being made for the damage done.

III. But to return to the Jews. They mention two kinds of sins, which, although when committed with knowledge they were to be punished with excision, yet when committed in ignorance might even be expiated by the greater or less sin offering. These were the offences of those, who either ate of the peace offerings, or entered into the sanctuary, when they were polluted by impurity.† Hence the rabbies conclude that the sins to be expiated by the definite sin offering were only forty-three, and those committed in ignorance. They are confident there were no more, if we except criminal words and sins of omission, and the two offences just named, against which excision was denounced when committed with knowledge. Twenty six of these sins are stated by the Jews‡ to have arisen from illicit intercourse; all which prudence requires me to pass over. The rest were committed by persons—who consulted magicians and wizards;—who sacrificed their children to Moloch;—who profaned the sabbath or the day of atonement by doing any work;—who took any meat or drink on the day of atonement;—who tasted any thing leavened during the seven days of the passover;—who ate of any peace offerings kept beyond the time appointed;—who ate any fat, or blood, or the fetid flesh of any victims;—who slew a victim in any other place than the sanctuary;—who offered the dissected

* Num. xxxv. 9, &c. Deut. xix. 1—6.

† Levit. vii. 20, 21. xv. 31. Num. xix. 20. ‡ Maimon. in Shegagoth, c. 1.

members of a victim in any other place;—who made the sacred oil or incense for profane uses;—and who anointed themselves with that oil.* Such then were the sins which when committed in ignorance, almost all the Jews conclude, might be legitimately expiated by what they call the definite sin offering. The only rabbi who dissents from the general opinion on this subject, is Aben Ezra; who maintains that this kind of sacrifices was also prescribed for those sins which when committed with knowledge were to be punished with scourging.† But the sins which when committed with knowledge were to be punished with stripes, are generally said by them to be two hundred and seven in number;‡ so that the opinion of Aben Ezra is much nearer to ours than that of the rest of the Jews. But our opinion having been just stated, it is unnecessary to repeat it here.

IV. The definite sin offering required from the high priest was a young bullock; from a ruler, a male kid; from any private individual, a female kid or lamb;§ but for defiled Nazarites, and for persons of any rank or either sex, who were to be purified from defilement caused by hæmorrhages or other specified impurities, the appointed sin offering was a turtle dove or young pigeon;‖ which was also to be accompanied with another bird of the same species, that was to be sacrificed as a burnt offering. Some have supposed that the requisition of sacrifices for the purification of all the grosser corporeal impurities, was designed to inculcate the far superior necessity

* Levit. xx. 6. 4, 5. Exod. xxxi. 14. Levit. xxiii. 29, 30. Exod xii. 15. Levit. xix. 8. vii. 25. 27. 18. xvii. 4. Exod. xxx. 33. 38.

† Ad Levit. iv. ‡ Maimon. in Sanhedrin, c. 19.

§ Levit. iv. 4. 23. 28. 32. ‖ Num. vi. 10, 11. Levit. xv. 15. 30.

of guarding against all impurity of mind; and that symbolical significations and recondite senses of this kind were included in most of the precepts of the law of Moses. Let it also be observed, that those defilements which required to be purified by sacrifices were communicated by contagion, like an infectious disease; so that persons polluted by them were considered as having polluted and injured others, and therefore as needing sacrificial atonement.* But thus perhaps it was also signified, that the mortal and impure bodies of men are not to be consecrated for immortality, except by a sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice of the Messiah, of which all these were figures. Reverence for the sanctuary, however, demanded that no person who had been defiled by any gross corporeal impurity, should be permitted to re-enter it without being purified by an expiatory sacrifice: and whatever belonged to reverence for the sanctuary, was equally connected with reverence for the divine Being who resided in it.

V. From the *definite* we proceed to the *ascending and descending sin offering*. And by these sacrifices, which were either more or less according to the ability of the offerer, were to be purged certain kinds both of sins and of impurities. The sacrifices of this sort were six. Two that were appointed for the purification of corporeal defilement, were so restricted by the law, that a person unable to procure a lamb or kid

* 'Sciendum, inquit Grotius, in Syriæ locis et vicinis non minus τὴν 'γονορροιαν quam τὰ εμμηνιὰ habere aliquid contagione nocens, unde ista 'legibus, quæ a lepræ legibus non longe abeunt, constringuntur.' *Ad Levit.* xv. 2. Accedit etiam, quod lepra, ac sanguinis, seminisque fluxio ex vita minus sancte acta ortum sæpenumero haberet. 'Quo minus mirum si sacra lege cautum esset, ut morbis illis inquinati piaculari hostia purgarentur.

was to offer a turtle dove and a young pigeon, one as a sin offering, and the other as a burnt offering. In the other four the provision was still further relaxed; a person who needed a sin offering, if in extreme poverty, being permitted to substitute an oblation of fine flour; which is commonly called *the meat offering of the sinner*, and which has been sufficiently noticed in a former chapter.

VI. The first sacrifice of this kind was appointed to be offered after the removal of leprosy. For this law, as I have hinted in the last note, various reasons may be offered. The most important in the opinion of the Jews, is, that no one, as they apprehend, was ever afflicted with leprosy, except on account of some sin that required sacrificial atonement. Thus Abarbinel:* 'This sacrifice of the leper was 'offered on that account, because it is a foundation 'of the law, and a principal article of faith, that all 'things which happen to men happen under the di-'rection of divine providence, according to the re-'spective actions and deserts of each individual: so 'that every leper ought to consider himself polluted 'with leprosy on account of his sins and trespasses.' And the leprosy was thought by Maimonides† to have been the punishment of evil speaking; and by Grotius,‡ of pride: which he supposes to have occasioned cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop to be used in the purification of a leper. 'The leprosy,' he says, 'is the punishment of pride, as is evident in the 'case of Miriam, Moses's sister, of Gehazi, and of 'Uzziah. The pride is emblematically signified by 'the cedar; the sin by the scarlet; and the hyssop 'denotes the opposite virtue of humility. For hyssop

* Ad Levit. xiv. † Moreh Nevoch. P. iii. c. 4. ‡ Ad Levit. xiv.

'grows on the ground, and has a purgative quality, as 'Porpyhry* says, was believed by the Egyptians.'

VII. Another sacrifice of this kind was required from women after childbirth: for which Abarbinel† assigns the same reason as for that which we have just mentioned. 'As no one bears pains and troubles 'in this world without guilt; and as, according to our 'rabbies of blessed memory, there is no chastisement 'without sin; and lastly as every woman bears children 'with pain and danger, hence every one is commanded, 'after childbirth, to offer an expiatory sacrifice.'

VIII. The third sacrifice of this description was appointed for all those who, while they were defiled by impurity arising from the touch of any thing unclean, but being unconscious of their pollution, ate of the sacrifices. Similar to this also was the fourth; which was prescribed for those who entered into the sanctuary, either altogether ignorant, or forgetful, of the pollution by which they were defiled.‡ Persons who were polluted by any uncleanness communicated by contact with any other person or thing, unless they either ate of the sacrifices, or entered into the sanctuary, needed no sacrificial expiation: but in order to their purification, were commanded to wash their bodies and their garments, and whenever they were defiled by a dead corpse, to take care that their bodies should be sprinkled with purifying water.§ On the performance of these rites they were considered as legitimately purified without any piacular sacrifice. Nor was any impurity, except what arose from leprosy, childbirth, hæmorrhage, or one other case already referred to, if connected with no other

* Ex Chæremone, in L. iv. de Abstinen. † Ad Levit. xii.
‡ Levit. v. § Levit. xi. 28. 40. Num. xix. 19, 20.

act or intention, so great in itself as to require sacrificial purgation. Wherefore those who were polluted by the touch of any unclean thing, except only the Nazarites, needed no expiatory victim, unless through imprudence they should profane either the sacrifices or the sanctuary. But a Nazarite defiled with a dead body was obliged to offer an expiatory victim, because every one who took the Nazarite's vow was bound not to come near any human corpse till after that vow was fulfilled.*

IX. The fifth sacrifice of this kind was enjoined upon all those, who, when called to swear concerning any matter to which they had been privy, were guilty of a suppression of evidence.† It was customary with the Hebrews to endeavour to obtain a confession of the truth, by using very solemn forms of adjuration. Thus Ahab said to Micaiah: "I adjure "thee that thou say nothing but the truth to me in the "name of the Lord."‡ And Caiaphas the high priest said to Jesus: "I adjure thee by the living God, "that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the "Son of God."§ It was by some such form that witnesses when standing before a tribunal were urged to give testimony.‖ And the expression of Moses, which we render "the voice of swearing," is rendered by the Septuagint, *the voice of adjuration:* which whoever heard that was privy to the truth, and refrained from delivering his testimony, he was guilty of a sin which required sacrificial expiation.

X. The last sacrifice of this kind, Maimonides¶ says, was enjoined upon those who unintentionally perjured themselves respecting something that was

* Num. vi. 6. † Levit. v. 5. ‡ II Chron. xviii. 15.
§ Matt. xxvi. 63 ‖ Prov. xxix. 24. ¶ In Shebuoth, c. 1.

past; or having sworn concerning something future and possible, and lawful for them, did, through forgetfulness, otherwise than they had sworn they would do. The Jews reckon four kinds of oaths.* The first they call *an oath of testimony;* as of witnesses before a tribunal, of which enough has been said already. The second is called an oath about a pledge: as when persons swear concerning any thing that belongs to another person, either intrusted to them, or found, or taken away by fraud or force;† which we shall presently notice. The third is *a vain oath:* this kind is described as including four sorts. The first relates to something present, and that manifestly false: as if any one were to swear that marble is gold. The second also relates to something present, and that manifestly true, which it is impossible to doubt: as if any one should swear that marble is marble. The third respects a thing altogether unlawful; as if any one were to swear that thenceforward he would never perform any particular duty. The last respects any thing evidently impossible: as if any one were to swear that he would fast for ten days. And concerning this kind, comprehending all these sorts, they maintain, that whoever sinned in this way with knowledge was to suffer the punishment of scourging; but that whoever committed this sin in ignorance, repentance alone was sufficient for its expiation without any piacular victim. The fourth kind of swearing, which is the only one referred by them to the present subject, they distinguish by an appellation taken from the scriptures, calling it *a pronounced oath.*‡ Of this kind they make four sorts: the two first respect something

* In Shebuoth, c. 1. † Levit. vi. 2, 3. ‡ Levit. v. 4.

past, one affirmative, the other negative; as if any one were to swear that this or that had or had not been done. The other two relate to any thing future, one affirming, the other denying; as if any one were to swear that he would sleep, or would not sleep, today. And concerning this kind of oath, including all its varieties, it is affirmed by the Jews, that whoever knowingly committed this sin, was not to offer an expiatory victim, but to be scourged; and that whoever sinned in this way through ignorance, it was commanded in the law, that the offence, when discovered, should be expiated by a sacrifice greater or less, according to the circumstances of each individual. Thus say the Jews: but what is the language of Moses on this subject?* "If a soul swear, pro-
"nouncing with his lips to do evil, or to do good,
"whatsoever it be that a man shall pronounce with
"an oath, and if it be hid from him; when he knoweth
"of it,—he shall confess that he hath sinned,—and he
"shall bring a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid,
"for a sin offering," if he were able to procure either; but if not, he was commanded to bring to the priest two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, one to be sacrificed as a sin offering, the other as a burnt offering: and any one who was too poor to procure such birds, was allowed to substitute the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour. But these words, "If a soul
"swear, pronouncing with his lips to do evil, or to
"do good," refer, whatever may be pretended by the Jews, to no other kind of oath than what relates to something future. The phrase, "to do evil," is to be understood of punishments permitted by the law; such as the demand of retaliation, revenge against a homicide, and other punishments of the same kind.

* Levit. v. 4—13.

CHAPTER XIII.

The Piacular Victims called Trespass Offerings. The Paschal Sacrifice.

FROM the sin offerings we proceed to the Trespass Offerings. Of these, according to the Jews, there were two kinds, *the doubtful trespass offering*, and *the certain trespass offering*. The victim for a doubtful trespass, they say, was enjoined upon those who conceived a suspicion that they had committed any sin, which, if ascertained, would require to be expiated by *the definite sin offering:* so that the sins to be expiated by both these kinds of sacrifice were evidently of the same nature, but were not objects of equal consciousness. Thus, if any person was certain that he had through ignorance eaten fat, or blood, or any of the peace offerings that had been kept beyond the time appointed, this offence, they affirm, was to be expiated by the definite sin offering: but if a person was only suspicious of his having committed such a sin, and not certainly conscious of it, in this case, they maintain that the law prescribed *the doubtful trespass offering;* and that this offence, if it were afterwards clearly ascertained, would require to be expiated again by the definite sin offering: for that the doubtful trespass offering was no otherwise available than to suspend the punishment till the offence should be ascertained beyond all doubt.

II. If you inquire for the law by which the doubtful trespass offering was instituted and enjoined, the Jews produce the following passage, in which they suppose it to be contained: "And if a soul sin, and "commit any of these things which are forbidden to

"be done by the commandments of the Lord; though "he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his "iniquity: and he shall bring a ram without blemish "out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass "offering unto the priest: and the priest shall make "an atonement for him concerning his ignorance "wherein he erred, and wist it not, and it shall be for-"given him."* And indeed there can be little doubt that the same sins are designated in this law, as in the law concerning the definite sin offerings; because, as every one must perceive, they are described in the same terms.† Nor is it any more to be doubted, that these two laws prescribe two different kinds of victims. For one requires from every private person a female lamb or kid; the other, a ram from a person of any class. How came it to pass, then, that the same sins were to be expiated sometimes by one kind of victims, sometimes by another? Because the same sins were the objects, in some cases of certain consciousness, and in others of uncertain suspicion. And this, the Jews say, is expressly taught by Moses, who commands a sin offering to be immolated only when it was certain that the sin had been committed; but the victim of which we are now treating, when there was only a suspicion of the crime, but no certain knowledge of it. Whence they call every such victim a *doubtful trespass offering*.

III. The certain trespass offering, like almost all the other piacular sacrifices, was appointed for the purgation of certain corporeal impurities, as well as for the expiation of trespasses properly so called. And in this kind are enumerated five victims, applicable to five different cases.—The first was prescribed for a

* Levit. v. 17. 18. † Compare Levit. iv. 2. 22. 27. with Levit. v. 17.

Nazarite, defiled in consequence of "any man dying "very suddenly by him."* The second was to be offered by a leper, at the time of his purification.† The third was commanded for any man who violated the chastity of a Hebrew "bondmaid betrothed to "an husband."‡ Nearly allied to this was the crime of those Jews who married Gentile women. Wherefore some priests, who during their exile in Babylon had "taken strange wives," expiated their offence, after their return to Judea, by this kind of sacrifice.§ This, however, as is correctly observed by the Jews, was not required by any precept of the law. Jarchi says: 'This was the counsel of that hour.'‖ And Aben Ezra: 'We find no precept requiring a tres-'pass offering from a man who marries a strange 'wife: but, perhaps, this was done by the counsel of 'the Sanhedrim.'¶—The fourth victim of this kind was appointed for all who ignorantly committed any fraud or injury in the holy things; and who, on making a compensation exceeding by one fifth the amount of the damage, and offering the prescribed victim, were forgiven.** The last was enjoined upon those, who denied with an oath their having possession of any thing belonging to another person, which they had been intrusted with, or had found, or had seized by violence, or gained by fraud.†† In order to their obtaining pardon for this sin, it was also commanded, that the property falsely denied, with the addition of one fifth of its value, should be restored to the original owner; or, in case of his death, to his relatives; or, if he left no relatives, to the priests.‡‡ Concerning

* Num. vi. 9. 12. † Levit. xiv. 12. ‡ Levit. xix. 20, 21.
§ Ezra x. 19. ‖ Ad Ezr. x. 19. ¶ Ibid. ** Levit. v. 15, 16.
†† Levit. vi. 2—6. ‡‡ Num. v. 7, 8.

damages done by one person to another, the law of Moses contained the following directions. Whoever made a spontaneous confession of a trespass committed against his neighbour, was required to make simple restitution, but nothing further.* Whoever denied a trespass, but whose crime was proved before the judges by upright witnesses, was not permitted to expiate his guilt by any piacular victim, but was commanded to make restitution, in some cases twofold, in others fourfold, in others fivefold, and in others only the simple amount of the damage done.† When any person was brought before the judges on a charge of trespass against his neighbour, and there were no witnesses to support the accusation, he was to exculpate himself by what was called "an oath of "the Lord."‡ And in this case, according to the Jews, although he should perjure himself by denying the crime, yet if he should afterwards confess it, and restore to the injured party the whole amount, with an addition of one fifth of the amount, of the damage done, he was permitted to expiate his guilt by a piacular sacrifice: for that the privilege granted in other cases to the ignorance and imprudence of the sinner, namely the benefit of piacular sacrifice, was granted in this case to his repentance, and indeed to the general interest of the public. But no evidence of repentance could be more unequivocal than a clearly voluntary confession of a crime known to no witnesses and previously denied, and a compensation of the damage done.

IV. But this opinion is strenuously opposed by Episcopius, who understands the law now under consideration, as having reference to no trespasses, but

* Maimon. in Geniba. c. 1. † Exod. xxii. 4. 7. 1. 6. ‡ Exod. xxii. 11.

those which were committed in ignorance or imprudence. 'It is no objection,' he says, 'that the text 'mentions a thing taken away by violence. For this 'crime may also be committed through error. As if 'a person believing a thing to be his own, which 'really belongs to his neighbour, were to take it from 'his neighbour by force, and to claim it for himself.'* But though this case may happen, yet many things forbid me to think that the law just mentioned had reference to no trespasses but such as arose from unintentional error. The terms in which it is expressed, —"If a soul sin, and lie unto his neighbour in that "which was delivered to him to keep, or in fellow-"ship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath "deceived his neighbour, or hath found that which "was lost, and lieth concerning it, and sweareth "falsely;"†—this is language so manifestly descriptive of trespasses of which the persons who commit them must be conscious, that it cannot without the greatest violence be applied to injuries which involve no culpable intention.‡ Besides; in all passages which direct the oblation of piacular sacrifices for sins of ignorance, the misapplication of them to cases of intentional transgression is particularly guarded against, by the ignorance of the offending parties being expressly mentioned.§ But in this passage not a word

* Instit. L. iii. c. 3. † Levit. vi. 2, 3.

‡ The word כחש when applied to verbal communications, as may be gathered from other passages, always includes the idea of deceit. The phrase תשומת יד denotes putting the hand fraudulently to another's property. (Exod. xxii. 8.) גזל invariably signifies some kind of plunder. עשק is commonly used of a person who oppresses his neighbour in such a way as to involve himself in heavy guilt, which is rarely done in ignorance. And שקר generally denotes a falsehood which the speaker knows to be so at the time when he utters it.

§ Levit. iv. 13. 22. 27. v. 2, 3, 4. 18.

is said of the ignorance of the offender, though, if the law related to unintentional errors, this was the more necessary to be specified, because the terms in which it is expressed, as must be evident to every reader, are so manifestly significant of transgressions committed with knowledge and design. Nor should it be forgotten, that the sacrifices appointed for those who sinned through ignorance, were commanded to be offered *when* they should know that they had sinned:* but nothing of this kind occurs in the law now under consideration; and for this obvious reason; because every person to whom it refers must be conscious of his sin at the time of its commission.

V. Episcopius replies 'that this interpretation is contradictory to those passages, where God declares that 'he "will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name 'in vain," and that whoever sinneth "presumptuously 'shall be cut off from among his people." *Exod.* 'xx. 7. *Num.* xv. 30.'† But neither of these laws appear to me to afford any support to his argument. For, not to introduce any rabbinical subtleties on this subject, the first passage he cites, in which God declares that he will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain, is a general law: and that which we are now discussing, is a special one. Now a special law is not limited by a general, but the general by the special. Consequently, the law here alleged by Episcopius ought always to be understood with the exception arising from this which we are now considering. Nor need we wonder, if the class of offenders designated in this law should be favoured with some peculiar mark of divine mercy. For they were persons who, when their guilt could not be

* Levit. iv. 14. 23. 28. v. 4. † Instit. ibid.

proved by any witnesses, and there were no means of detecting it, yet of their own accord confessed their crimes, and repaired the damages they had caused. It is likewise a consideration not to be overlooked, that the general interest of the nation was promoted by the hope of forgiveness held out to these offenders;—the tendency of which would naturally be to render every one, who had privately injured another, more disposed to make compensation, which, without some hope of forgiveness, no one would ever have rendered. Though it may also be doubted, whether those transgressors whose pardon was to be obtained by sacrifice, could be said to be "held guiltless" according to the meaning of the law: which declares respecting every such person, as the reason why he was obliged to offer a victim for the expiation of his guilt, that "he shall bear his iniquity."*

VI. The other passage adduced by Episcopius, in which excision is denounced against presumptuous transgressors, has no reference whatever to the subject of our present inquiry. For this, as we have already remarked, is the case of those who knowingly committed some wrong unobserved by any witnesses; and who were instigated not by contempt of the law, but by criminal desires after the property of others. Such persons were chargeable with sinning "presumptuously" or, as it is literally in the Hebrew, "with a high hand." None were guilty of this crime, but those who, as the words immediately following express, "reproached the Lord:"† nor was any one considered as reproaching the Lord, but such as openly cast contempt upon his commands. Abarbinel restricts the crime of sinning with a high hand

* Levit. v. 1. 17. † Num. xv. 30.

to those who deny the law to be of divine origin; and that 'publicly, perversely and deliberately.'* Abarbinel is followed by Grotius,† who contends that the phrase, "he that doeth ought presumptuously" is to be understood of one 'who obstinately denies the 'being of a God, or the divine inspiration of the 'law.' But this subject has been most judiciously illustrated by Maimonides:‡ 'He sins with a high 'hand, who casts off shame, and sins openly. Such 'a person transgresses the law, not merely because he 'is hurried into forbidden things by the impulse of 'his unbridled passion and corrupt desires, but be-'cause he denies the authority of the law, and deter-'mines openly to resist it. Whence he is said to 'reproach God: a crime which ought certainly to be 'punished with death. For no person ever commits 'this sin without entertaining some opinion which 'subverts the authority of the law.' But such contempt of the law could not be imputed to one who of his own accord confessed an injury which he had privately done to his neighbour, and made compensation for it; although, under the influence of criminal desire for the property of another, he had before violated his conscience and perjured himself by denying the crime.

VII. Nor ought it to be objected that an apostle calls those sins "errors,"§ which were expiated by the victims sacrificed on the annual day of atonement. For those victims were *sin offerings;* but we are now treating of another kind, namely *trespass offerings,* or rather of one particular sort of that kind: so that no conclusion can fairly be drawn from one sort of one kind to the whole of the other kind. Sins ex-

* Ad Num. xv. † Ibid. ‡ Moreh Nevoch. P. iii. c. 41 § Heb. ix. 7.

piated by animal sacrifices, the apostle has properly called *errors*, because this term was descriptive of the far greater number of those transgressions which were so to be expiated. It has also been supposed by Grotius, that the apostle used this word in tenderness for the honour of the high priest. He says:* 'Though on the day of atonements all sins were expiated, to which the law had not annexed the 'punishment of death, or excision, yet this writer 'preferred using the word *errors*, that he might spare 'the honour of the high priest, who both offered and 'prayed for himself, and who was not to be presumed to have sinned otherwise than through ignorance.'—Not to dwell any longer on these things, therefore, I am of opinion that all those, who had privately injured another, and when conscious of their guilt had even denied it with wilful perjury, were allowed the benefit of expiation by a piacular victim, if they should afterwards of their own accord confess their guilt, and make reparation for the injury they had done. This ought not to be thought strange, when it is beyond all doubt that others might avail themselves of sacrificial atonement, who were conscious of their crimes while they were committing them. Such, as I have already remarked, were those who, when solemnly adjured to give evidence concerning any fact of which they had been witnesses, withheld their testimony. And the same may be said of one who violated a Jewish "bondmaid betrothed to "an husband." For though this crime might happen to be committed by one who was uninformed of the espousals, yet the law which directs the expiation of the crime by an animal sacrifice, contains no such

* Ad Heb. ix. 7.

provision. And any provision, exception, or limitation, not expressed in the law, cannot without manifest impropriety be introduced in those things, in which, whenever such provision, exception, or limitation is designed, it is explicitly stated in the law itself.

VIII. Thus we have discussed the piacular sacrifices both *sin offerings* and *tresspass offerings*. Both these names are sometimes given to the same victim.* If you inquire what was the difference between the crimes themselves, which were designated by these appellations, *sins*† and *trespasses*;‡ I reply, that after frequent and diligent consideration, I have not discovered any one thing by which they can be distinguished. Abarbinel § maintains, that a *sin* is an act which the person who commits it knows to be wrong, and a *trespass* an act concerning which he is in doubt. But this definition is inaccurate, because it does not comprehend the *certain trespass*. Aben Ezra ‖ supposes *sins* to be committed through ignorance of the law, and *trespasses* from forgetfulness of it. But he gives no proof of either part of this explanation; which also, as he himself observes, excludes the *doubtful trespass*. No assistance can be derived towards an explanation of the original terms from the corresponding terms employed in the Septuagint version:¶ for it is by no means certain what is the difference between the two Greek words, much less whether there is precisely the same difference between them, as between the two Hebrew words for which they are respectively used. Grotius** supposes a

* Levit. v. 6. † חטאות ‡ אשמות § In Præf. ad Levit.
‖ Ad Levit. v. ¶ חטאה is rendered *αμαρτια*, and אשם *πλημμελεια*.
** Ad Levit. v.

sin to be a fault of omission, and a *trespass* a fault of commission; than which nothing can be further from the truth: for the word rendered *sin* is very often applied to a transgression of a prohibitory precept; as Grotius himself elsewhere observes.* Saubert† explains a *sin* to be an unintentional error, and a *trespass* an act of wilful and violent wickedness.‡ But this cannot be supported; since a waste or alienation of the sacred things committed through ignorance or mistake, is designated in the law as a trespass.§ Others understand a *sin* to have been such an offence against God as was attended with no detriment to men; and *trespass* to denote an injury done to men. But the advocates of this opinion do not consider, that the same kind of crime, which, whenever it had been fully ascertained, is called *sin* in the scriptures, ought to have the appellation of *trespass* whenever there was any doubt of the fact; which, however, must certainly be the case, if those things are true, that we have said concerning the doubtful trespass offering. And indeed, if those things are true, though I find these two terms, *sin* and *trespass*, often used in the same sense, yet I should think that the word *trespass* particularly denoted an offence which either was doubtful to the person guilty of it, whence the doubtful trespass offering; or caused some injury to a neighbour, whence the certain trespass offering: which (if you except polluted Nazarites and lepers, who, as they were to be purged by sin

* Ad Levit. iv. † De Sacrif. c. 3.

‡ TR.—This mistaken notion was also entertained by Philo and Josephus; who both represent *sin offerings* as prescribed for offences of ignorance or incaution, and *trespass offerings* for deliberate and wilful transgressions. *Phil. de Vict. Offerend. Joseph. Antiq.* L. iii. c. 10. Vide *Roberts. Clav. Pentateuch.* p. 404. § Levit. v. 15.

offerings as well as trespass offerings, are not to be taken into the account in this place) was not enjoined but upon those whose conduct was at once offensive to God, and injurious to their neighbour. Such was the case of those, who through ignorance defrauded the priests of any of the holy things which belonged to them:*—of those also, who with false oaths denied their having possession of the property of another, which they had been intrusted with, or had found, or had seized by force, or obtained by fraud:†—of those, in the last place, (and there were no more who were commanded by the law to offer this kind of sacrifice:)—of those who violated the chasity of of a Jewish "bondmaid betrothed to an husband;"‡—by which they subjected the bride to be scourged, and caused pain and disgrace to the bridegroom.

IX. But whatever was the difference between the offences called *sins* and those denominated *trespasses*, it is evident that there were several points of difference between the sacrifices respectively designated by these terms. The sex of the victims and the rites to be performed in the trespass offerings, were altogether different from those prescribed for the sin offerings. The trespass offerings always consisted of rams and he-lambs, which were never used for sin offerings. The blood of the sin offerings was to be put upon the horns of the altar,§ and that of the trespass offerings was to be sprinkled on the sides of the altar.‖ Sin offerings also, as we shall soon have occasion to show, were commanded to be offered for the whole congregation of Israel; but trespass offerings were only required from individuals. These

* Levit v. 15. † Levit. vi. 2—4. ‡ Levit. xix. 20, 21.
§ Levit. iv. 7. 18. 25. 30. ‖ Levit. vii. 2.

two kinds of sacrifices had this point of resemblance, that they were considered as legitimately offered, only in compliance with the express command of the law; neither of them was ever admitted as a votive or voluntary oblation: *that* was peculiar to peace offerings and burnt offerings. 'No one,' says Maimonides,* 'can legitimately promise a sin offering or trespass offering by a vow, or present either of them as a voluntary sacrifice. The only sacrifices which are votive or voluntary, are burnt offerings and peace offerings.' Abarbinel maintains the same opinion; concluding, I apprehend, that there was no reason for the oblation of a piacular sacrifice, except by one who had been guilty of some crime that required sacrificial atonement. For though many sins were committed, which were never known to those who committed them, all transgressions of this kind were expiated by those expiatory sacrifices which were offered at stated seasons for the whole congregation of Israel.

X. From the sacrifices of individuals, we proceed to the paschal sacrifice, enjoined on separate families or small neighbourhoods.† For whenever one family was large enough to eat the sacrificial feast on the appointed day, no more were to be invited to partake of one and the same victim. But if any family happened to be too small, then the requisite number was made up by the association of some of the nearest neighbours.‡—The paschal sacrifice derives its original appellation from a Hebrew word which sig-

* Præf. ad Zebach. in Misna.

† Another victim of this description was the bullock offered as a sin offering for the family of Aaron on the day of atonement. *Levit.* xvi. 6.

‡ Exod. xii. 3, 4.

nifies *to pass over*. It was, as the scripture declares, "the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed "over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, "when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered the "houses" of the Israelites* This victim, "a male "of the first year, without blemish, from the sheep "or from the goats,"† was to be chosen on the tenth day of the month Abib in every year, to be kept till the fourteenth day of the same month, and then to be slain in the evening.‡ When it is commanded in the law, to "sacrifice the *passover*, of the flock and of the "*herd*;§" this refers, not to the paschal victim properly so called, but to other sacrifices which were to be offered at the same time:‖ and these, according

* Exod. xii. 27.

† TR.—As here is an express direction to take either a lamb or a kid, so the word שה used in this and the two preceding verses embraces both these species: but it is more generally rendered *lamb*, and it is probable that, for the passover, *lambs* were generally preferred. Theodoret understands the meaning of the law to have been, 'that whoever had a lamb, should 'immolate it; but whoever had not a lamb, should sacrifice a kid.' And the same sense is favoured by the version of the passage in the Vulgate. *Pooli Synops. in Exod.* xii. 3. 5.

‡ Exod. xii. 5, 6. § Deut. ii. 16.

‖ TR.—Thus in the account of a solemn passover in the time of Josiah, "we read that "Josiah gave to the people, of the flock, lambs and kids, "all for the passover offerings, for all that were present, to the number of "thirty thousand, and three thousand bullocks: and his princes—gave unto "the priests for the passover offerings two thousand and six hundred small "cattle, and three hundred oxen;—also, unto the Levites for passover "offerings five thousand small cattle, and five hundred oxen." Here it seems rather doubtful whether the term "passover offerings," literally in Hebrew *passovers*, should be taken in an enlarged sense, comprehending all the cattle enumerated as allotted for that festival, both of the flock and of the herd; or whether it should be referred exclusively to the small cattle, lambs, and kinds. But in a subsequent part of the same narrative we find a clear distinction made between the passover itself, and the other oblations with which it was accompanied. "They roasted the passover "with fire according to the ordinance: but the other holy offerings sod "they in pots and in caldrons, and in pans, and divided them speedily

to the Jews, were burnt offerings *of appearance*, and *festive and rejoicing* peace offerings; of both which we have already treated.

XI. Nor ought it to be thought strange that we number the paschal victim among the proper sacrifices. For the animal used for this service is expressly called *Corban* in the scriptures;* and after the departure of the people from Egypt, it was to be slain in the sanctuary, and the blood was to be sprinkled upon the altar by the priests:† circumstances sufficiently characteristic of a sacrifice. If it be inquired to what class of victims it belongs, I think it may properly be placed among the eucharistic. For though the first passover celebrated in Egypt was designed as the means of averting from the families of Israel the pestilence then awaiting the Egyptians, yet every anniversary of this festival had reference to the deliverance vouchsafed to the Israelites, when all the firstborn of the Egyptians, both man and beast, were suddenly destroyed: and hence the paschal ceremonies were always to include a brief commemoration of these events.‡

"among all the people." II *Chron.* xxxv. 7, 8, 9. 13. So at the remarkable passover celebrated by Hezekiah, it is said, "they did eat throughout "the feast seven days, offering *peace offerings*. II *Chron.* xxx. 22.

* Num. ix. 7. 13. † II Chron. xxxv. 11.

‡ Exod. xii. 13, 14. 25, 26, 27.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Sacrifices of the Whole Congregation of Israel.

OUR attention is next called to the Sacrifices of the Whole Congregation; which are so denominated,—first, because they were enjoined upon the whole nation, as a religious community connected by certain laws;—and secondly, because they were to be procured by persons acting as representatives of the nation, because they were to be offered in the name of the whole congregation of Israel, and because their efficacy, by the appointment of the law itself, extended to all the people. Some of them were offered on particular occasions, and others at stated seasons. On one occasion, they were required to offer a young bullock for a sin offering;* in another case, they were to bring a kid for a sin offering, accompanied by a young bullock as a burnt offering.† And it is said by the Jews, that twelve victims of each of these species were to be sacrificed, whenever the people were drawn into strange worship by the influence or example of the great Sanhedrim; and the like number of bullocks, whenever the people were led by the error of the Sanhedrim to the commission of any sin, which, if perpetrated knowingly and deliberately, was to be punished with excision. The rabbies affirm also, that these kinds of victims were required to be offered, whenever a sin of this description was committed, either by a majority of the tribes, though they might be a minority of the nation; or by a majority of the nation, which might be a minority of the tribes. But if the people sinned of them-

* Levit. iv. 13, 14. † Num. xv. 24.

selves, and not from the instructions of the Sanhedrim, they maintain that every individual was to offer his sacrifice for himself alone, and no sacrifice was to be offered for the whole congregation; for that nothing extended to the whole congregation but what was done by the appointment of the Sanhedrim. Maimonides says:* 'If at any time, in reference to 'those things, which when done in ignorance ought 'to be duly expiated by the definite sin offering, the 'great Sanhedrim have erred, teaching that to be 'lawful which in reality is unlawful, and the people, 'following their instructions, have committed any 'sin; the Sanhedrim, after they have fully ascertained 'their error, shall offer a sin offering, although they 'may have done nothing themselves, for the point of 'consideration is not what the Sanhedrim do or leave 'undone, but what they teach; and the rest of the 'people, though the sin committed was committed 'by them, yet because they relied on the judgment 'of the Sanhedrim, will not be required to bring 'any piacular sacrifice. But what is the victim 'which the Sanhedrim ought to offer for this crime. 'If they have erred respecting strange worship, then 'they are to bring for each tribe one bullock as a 'burnt offering, and one goat as a sin offering. This 'sacrifice is commanded in the law: "If ought be 'committed by the congregation through ignorance;" 'Num. xv. 24. which it is certain, from the tradition 'of the elders, relates to strange worship. But if the 'Sanhedrim have erred and taught what is wrong 'concerning other deadly sins, which when com-'mitted in ignorance require to be expiated by the 'definite sin offering; then they are to offer for each

* In Shegagoth, c. 12.

'tribe a bullock as a sin offering, according to the 'law: "If the whole congregation of Israel sin;" '*Levit.* iv. 13.' The same account is given by almost all the Jews except Aben Ezra: but this rabbi,* who generally adopts a more simple mode of interpreting the scriptures, is of opinion, that sins of ignorance, chargeable on the whole congregation in a way of commission, were to be expiated by the bullock directed to be sacrificed as a sin offering; but that the goat appointed for a sin offering, and the bullock which was to be added as a burnt offering, were to expiate all the national sins of this description, both of commission and of omission: and his principal reason for this opinion seems to be, that the law respecting the latter victims mentions, both things done and things omitted.

II. If my own opinion be inquired,—I would not be confident on so obscure a subject, but I am inclined to think, that the bullock was to be offered, when the whole congregation of Israel, though in other respects retaining their own rites, and following the worship of the true God, yet led away by one common error, transgressed, without knowing it, some prohibitory precept. This appears to me to be the best interpretation of the following passage of the law: "And if the whole congregation of Israel sin "through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the "eyes of the assembly, and they have done somewhat "against any of the commandments of the Lord, "concerning things which should not be done, and "are guilty: when the sin which they have sinned "against it is known, then the congregation shall offer "a young bullock for the sin."† The kid for a sin

* Ad Num. xv. † Levit. iv. 13, 14.

offering, accompanied with a bullock for a burnt offering, I apprehend to have been required, when the people, neglecting their ancient rites, and unmindful of the divine laws, which often happened under wicked kings, were generally seduced into strange worship. This I conceive to be the true sense of the other passage; "And if ye have erred, and not observed all these commandments, which the Lord hath spoken to Moses, even all that the Lord hath commanded you, by the hand of Moses, from the day that the Lord commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations: then it shall be, if ought be committed by the congregation through ignorance; that all the congregation shall offer one young bullock for a burnt offering, for a sweet savour unto the Lord, with his meat offering, and his drink offering, according to the manner, and one kid of the goats for a sin offering."* As this law seems to contemplate a state of the nation, in which the rites of their fathers were neglected, and strange ceremonies introduced; so perhaps it commands a holocaust to be offered in token of a return to their ancient worship and religion, and a sin offering for the expiation of all the sins which had been committed in the substitution of idolatry for the worship of the true God. For this reason I suppose it was, and it is a circumstance which adds much probability to my opinion, that, after the temple had been long shut,† the daily sacrifices discontinued, and many strange rites admitted by the people through ignorance, Hezekiah commanded bullocks to be immolated as burnt offerings and goats as sin offerings for the whole nation.‡ Thus also the Jews who returned

* Num. xv. 22—24. † II Chron. xxviii. 24. xxix. 3. ‡ II Chron. xxix. 21—24.

from Babylon into their own land, offered, after the rebuilding of the temple, and the restoration of their ancient worship, the same kinds of sacrifices for all Israel.* It forms no objection, that, whereas Moses commanded only one bullock and one goat, Hezekiah sacrificed seven, and the Jews who returned from exile offered twelve, of each kind of victims. This I suppose them to have done, from a conviction that the smaller number was absolutely necessary, but that the larger number was better: Hezekiah chusing the number seven, as an emblem of perfection; and the returned exiles fixing upon twelve, in reference to the number of the tribes.

III. To the occasional sacrifices for the whole congregation, some persons add the red heifer, which the law directed to be burned without the camp. This heifer, like all the other victims, was to be free from all blemish, and the priest was to sprinkle her blood towards the sanctuary seven times; and the ashes were to be used for the purification of those who were defiled by touching a human corpse.† Abarbinel says:‡ 'The red heifer was a sin offering 'for the whole congregation.' And a little after: 'My opinion is, that the red heifer was a sacrifice 'for the whole congregation of the children of Israel, 'by which they were purified from the defilement of 'a dead body, that they might not pollute the sanc-'tuary, and its holy things.' This opinion I so far approve, as to admit that the red heifer might truly be called a sin offering; but I think it cannot be considered as a *Corban*, according to the scriptural use of that term; which is only applied to what was solemnly offered to God before his altar. The same

* Ezra viii. 35. † Num. xix. 2, 3, 4. 13. ‡ Ad Num. xix.

observation must be made concerning the other heifer, whose head was to be cut off, when murder had been committed in a field and the murderer was not known.* For though this victim could not be denominated a *Corban*, because it was not brought to the altar, yet that it was a sin offering for the expiation of the murder, is evident from the form of deprecation pronounced over it: "Our hands have not shed "this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be mer-"ciful, O Lord, unto thy people Israel, whom thou "hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto thy "people of Israel's charge."

Though many good men, especially kings and persons of eminence, sometimes offered sacrifices with the intention of commending the whole nation to God by those oblations, as was evidently done by Samuel, and David, and Solomon;† yet such sacrifices were no more to be considered as sacrifices of the whole congregation, than the prayers of individuals for the safety of the people at large could be called the prayers of the whole congregation. It may be added that all such were voluntary oblations; of which kind, according to the Jews, were none of the sacrifices of the whole congregation. Maimonides‡ says: 'The con-'gregation uses none but stated prayers, because the 'congregation offers no victims but those which are 'commanded in the law.'

IV. Of the *stated* sacrifices of the whole congregation, some were daily, others weekly, others monthly, and others annual: and of those which were annual, some belonged to the feast of passover, others to the feast of pentecost, others to the feast of trumpets,

* Deut. xxi. 1—9. † I Sam. vii. 9. I Chron. xvi. 1, 2. II Chron. vii.
‡ In Tephil. Ubireath Cohan. c. 1.

others to the day of atonement, and others to the feast of tabernacles. We shall briefly mention them all.

Every day were to be offered two lambs, one in the morning, and the other in the evening, "for a con-"tinual burnt offering."* To these daily victims were to be added, weekly, two other lambs, "for the burnt "offering of every sabbath."† At the commencement of every month, two young bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs were to be sacrificed as a burnt offering, and a kid for a sin offering.‡ On each of the seven days of the paschal feast, the same sacrifices were to be offered as at the commencement of every month;§ with the addition, on the second day, on which the first fruits were consecrated by the wave sheaf, of another lamb for a burnt offering.‖ On the feast of pentecost also, the same sacrifices were to be offered as at the beginning of every month;¶ with the addition of one young bullock, two rams, and seven lambs for a burnt offering, two other lambs as peace offerings, and one kid for a sin offering.** At the feast of trumpets, which which was the first day of the seventh month, were to be offered, beside the regular monthly victims, one young bullock, one ram, and seven lambs for a burnt offering, and one kid for a sin offering.†† The like sacrifices, without the monthly ones, were to be offered on the solemn day of atonement;‡‡ and to them was to be added another ram for a burnt offering, and another goat, the most eminent of all the sacrifices, for a sin offering, whose blood was to be carried by the high priest into the inner sanctuary; which was not done by the blood of

* Num. xxviii. 3, 4. † Ibid. v. 9, 10. ‡ Ibid. v. 11. 14, 15.
§ Ibid. v. 19. 22. 24. ‖ Levit. xxiii. 12. ¶ Num. xxviii. 27. 30.
** Levit. xxiii. 18, 19. †† Num. xxix. 2. 5. ‡‡ Ibid. v. 8. 11.

any other victim, except the bullock which was offered the same day as a sin offering for the family of Aaron.* On the first day of the feast tabernacles, thirteen young bullocks, two rams, and fourteen lambs were to be offered as a burnt offering, and one kid for a sin offering. The like number of victims was to be offered on each of the next six days, except that the number of bullocks was to be one less on every successive day, so that on the seventh day of the feast there were to be but seven. The sacrifices for the eighth day of this festival were to be one bullock, one ram, and seven lambs for a burnt offering, and one goat for a sin offering.† And in all these cases this rule was to be observed, that whenever more than one festival happened on the same day, the daily sacrifices and the sacrifices appointed for those festivals were all to be offered in regular order.‡ Suppose the sabbath, the beginning of the month, and the feast of trumpets, to have happened on the same day; the daily morning sacrifice was to be offered first, the sabbatical sacrifices next, then the monthly sacrifices, then the sacrifices appointed for the feast of trumpets, and last of all the daily evening sacrifice.§

V. As those burnt offerings which were sacrificed every day belonged to the daily worship of God, and were services by which his favour might be daily implored and commemorated; so the other burnt offerings, together with peace offerings, immolated at stated seasons, contributed to the greater solemnity of those seasons, which God required to be consecrated to himself on various accounts which it would

* Levit. xvi. 5, 6, 14, 15. † Num. xxix. 13—38.

‡ Num. xxviii. 15. 23, 24. 31. xxix. 6. 11. 16. 19, &c.

§ Maimon. in Præf. ad Zebach. in Misna. Abarb. in Præf. ad Levit.

be irrelevant to our present purpose to introduce in this place. The sin offerings appointed for those stated seasons, I apprehend were designed to expiate whatever sins had been committed, of which the persons guilty of them were unconscious. This is asserted by Rabbi Jehuda:* 'Those sins, which are 'not known, either before or after their commission, 'to the persons guilty of them, are expiated by the 'goats offered at the beginnings of the months and at 'the greater festivals.'

VI. Such were the sacrifices enjoined on the Hebrews by the law of Moses. Some of them are called by the Jews *most holy sacrifices*, and others *light* or *inferior sacrifices*. The appellation of most holy is given to those of which no part at all was to be eaten, or of which none were allowed to eat but a priest or the son of a priest, and that only within the sanctuary: a description which applies to all the burnt offerings, all the sin offerings, and the peace offerings of the whole congregation. The sacrifices considered as inferior are those of which others also were allowed to eat in any part of Jerusalem: such were the peace offerings of inviduals, and all other similar oblations, as the paschal victims, and the tithes. To these may be added the male firstlings, which might lawfully be eaten, not only by the priests and their sons, but also by any other persons, as we have already stated, within the city of Jerusalem.

* Shebuoth in Misna, c. 1.

CHAPTER XV.

Certain Sacrificial Rites; particularly, the Offering and Waving of the Victims, the Imposition of Hands upon their Heads, and the Prayers connected with that Ceremony.

WE now proceed to the Sacrificial Rites; which were different for different sacrifices. For the burnt offerings of individuals, the following was the process to be observed. First, each person was to present his own victim before the great altar. Then he was to lay his hand, and, according to Maimonides, both hands, upon its head, and at the same time to say some solemn prayers. When these were finished, the victim was immediately to be slain, and its blood poured round about the sides of the altar. After this it was to be flayed, and cut up. Next the legs and entrails were to be washed, and then, with the dissected members, offered at the ascent of the altar, and all the parts, after being there sprinkled with salt, were to be laid upon the sacred fire. Except the imposition of hands and the prayers which accompanied that ceremony, the same rites were to be performed upon the burnt offerings of the whole congregation. In the rest of the sacrifices, some of these rites were omitted, some were altered, and others were added. The lamb required for a trespass offering for a leper,* and the two lambs appointed to be offered as the peace offerings of the whole congregation,† after they were brought to the altar, were, while yet living, to be waved towards all the quarters of the world. The same rite was to be performed with the

* Levit. xiv. 12. † Levit. xxiii. 20.

right shoulder, and the breast of the peace offerings of individuals;* and with one shoulder of the ram of the Nazarite, which was to be previously boiled.† The flesh of some victims was to be burnt without the camp, or without the city of Jerusalem; and that of others was to be eaten. And as there were various victims which were allowed to be eaten, so there were various laws concerning the eating of them. But on these and similar points we shall have to enlarge in a subsequent chapter.

II. Of the rites connected with the sacrifices of individuals, some were to be the acts of the offerers themselves, and others of the priests; while some might be legitimately performed by any person that was ceremonially clean. It was the business of the offerer to bring his victim to the altar, and to lay his hands upon its head. But the killing, the flaying, the cutting up, and the washing of the legs and entrails, as was done in burnt offerings, if at all inconvenient for the offerer himself, might be confided to any other clean person. For though all these things seem to be enjoined upon the offerers,‡ yet the meaning of this law is, not that these rites were to be the acts of the offerers and of them only, but that they were to be considered as duly performed, though not performed by the priests. The law respecting some other rites was evidently different. To wave the victim, or any parts of it, towards the various quarters of the world, to sprinkle the blood, to lay the divided parts on the altar, and to set in order the sacrificial fire; all these were the exclusive acts of the priests. To them also it belonged, to kill the birds that were destined for the altar; because the sprinkling of their blood was imme-

* Levit. vii. 30. † Num. vi. 19, 20. ‡ Levit. i. 5, 6. 9. 11, 12, 13.

diately connected with the act of killing them.* In the occasional sin offerings of the whole congregation, the elders, as representatives of the people, were commanded to bring the victims to the altar, and to lay their hands upon them.† The other rites for all the victims of the whole congregation used to be performed by the priests and Levites: namely, all those which in the sacrifices of individuals we have said were enjoined on the offerers themselves, by the priests; and the rest, either by them, or by the Levites.‡ Such rites, however, as in the sacrifices of the whole congregation might legitimately be performed by the Levites, were not considered as at all polluted if they happened to be performed by any other person that was free from ceremonial defilement.§ Nor must it be forgotten, that there were some victims, whose blood could be lawfully sprinkled only by the high priest. Such were all those, whose blood was to be carried into either sanctuary. These were, the bullock for a sin offering for the family of Aaron, and the goat for a sin offering for all the people, both slain on the day of atonement;‖ the occasional sin offerings of the whole congregation;¶ and the bullock for the sin offering for the high priest,** which, as should have been mentioned before, Maimonides†† affirms was to be offered whenever the high priest of his own accord had through ignorance himself committed, and taught others to commit, any thing which if perpetrated knowingly and deliberately was to be punished with excision. My opinion concerning these things may be understood from what I have said in a

* Levit. i. 15. v. 8. † Levit. iv. 14, 15. ‡ II Chron. xxix. 24. 34. xxx. 16, 17.
§ Maimon. in Biath Hamikdash, c. 9. ‖ Levit. xvi. 14, 15.
¶ Levit. iv. 14. 16, 17, 18. ** Levit. iv. 5—7. †† In Shegagoth, c. 15.

former chapter: but it is sufficient to have glanced at them all in this place. We must proceed to a more particular explication of the sacrificial rites.

III. And first, the victim, duly selected according to the prescriptions of the law, was to be placed before the great altar. This is the meaning of the command, which we find repeated on all occasions, that the offerer was to bring his victim, "to the door "of the tabernacle;"* for that was the place where the great altar stood.† The reason for mentioning the door of the tabernacle rather than the altar, I suppose was to guard against a notion that victims might lawfully be offered at altars in other places; which might have been supposed, if only the altar had been mentioned, and not the door of the tabernacle. It may also be added, that the Supreme Legislator, by naming the tabernacle, which was his own habitation, and the shadowy residence of his Divine Majesty, afforded a plain intimation that sacrifices were to be offered to him only, and not to any strange gods: which indeed was the reason assigned by himself for requiring all victims to be brought to this place. "What man soever there be "of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, "or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out of the "camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the "tabernacle of the congregation, to offer an offering "unto the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord; "blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath "shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from "among his people: to the end that the children of "Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer

* Levit. i. 3. iv. 4. 14. xii. 6. xiv. 23. xv. 14. 29. xvii. 4, 5. 9.
† Exod. xl. 6. 29. Levit. i. 5. iv. 7. xvii. 6.

"in the open field, even that they may bring them "unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of "the congregation, unto the priest, and offer them "for peace offerings unto the Lord: and the priest "shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord "at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, "and burn the fat for a sweet savour unto the Lord: "and they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto "devils, after whom they have gone a whoring."* Every service which during the continuance of the tabernacle was to be performed at the altar which stood before its door, was afterwards to be performed at the altar which stood before the door of the temple at Jerusalem.

IV. The placing of the victim before the altar was the *offering* of that victim: this act was the oblation which God intended in the command to *offer* the victim *at the door of the tabernacle.* This requires to be particularly noted, lest any one should be misled by those persons who, supposing that the sacrifice of every victim was completed by these two rites, *killing* and *offering*, place the offering after the killing; as if there had been no oblation of the victim, prior to its being killed: whereas on the contrary, the placing of the animal about to be sacrificed, before the door of the tabernacle, or before the altar which stood near it, was the offering of the animal, and is generally designated by that term. I do not deny that the scriptures sometimes describe the blood, fat, and other parts of the victim, as *offered* when they were brought to the altar. But this was only the oblation of those parts of the slaughtered victim which were laid upon the

* Levit xviii. 5—7.

altar, and not that of the entire victim, which is said to have been offered while it was yet living. And indeed the blood is much more frequently described as *sprinkled* or *poured*, and the fat and other parts as *burnt*, upon the altar, than as *offered*. Though to preclude all occasion of cavil in so plain a matter, I readily admit a twofold oblation of the sacrifices; and indeed I find a twofold oblation every where described in the scriptures: the first, of the victim while yet alive; the second, of the blood, fat, and other parts: or one, of the victim about to be slain; the other, of the victim already slain. The former belonged to the owners of the victim, the latter to the priests.

V. In the peace offerings of the whole congregation, and the trespass offering of the leper,* the oblation of the victim was immediately followed by the *waving* of it towards all the parts of the world.† It was waved *upwards*, *forwards*, and *backwards*, *towards the right*, and *towards the left*; acts by which it was solemnly presented or delivered over to God, considered as the omnipresent and omniscient sovereign of the universe. This is the representation of Abarbinel:‡ 'The waving is thus performed by 'the priest: he reaches it forth upwards and down-'wards, and on all sides, towards the six parts of 'the world, [illegible]oken that the earth is the Lord's, 'and the fulness thereof.' R. Bechai says:§ 'He 'moves it forwards and backwards to him whose 'are the four quarters of the world; and upwards 'and downwards to him who is the Lord of heaven 'and earth.' Nor has this rite been differently ex-

* Levit. xxiii. 20. xiv. 12. 24. † Maimon. in Mechussere Chippur. c. 4.
‡ Ad Levit. xxiii. § Ad Levit. viii.

plained by R. Levi Ben Gerson;* who considers 'it as designed to teach us, that the providence of 'God extends to every place both above and below, 'wherever any beings exist.'

VI. In some other sacrifices, the ceremony of waving was omitted, and the oblation of the victim was immediately succeeded by imposition of hands. Thus it was ordained in the law, that when the victim was placed at the door of the tabernacle, the offerer should lay his hand upon its head; and, according to Maimonides, both hands, and that with all his might.† This rite, as is evident from the scriptures, was to be performed on all the burnt offerings, peace offerings, and sin offerings of individuals, which were chosen from quadrupeds;‡ and also, according to the opinion of the Jews, on the trespass offerings, the design and efficacy of which were the same as of sin offerings: but, as they say, not on sacrificed birds, the paschal victims, the firstlings, or the tithes. Thus Maimonides:§ 'On all the victims of indivi-'duals chosen from bullocks, sheep, or goats, whe-'ther commanded or voluntary, beside the paschal 'sacrifice, the firstlings, and the tithes, the hands of 'the offerer were to be laid.' And just after he adds: 'But it is not necessary to lay hands upon 'birds.' The same account is given by all the Jews. And as these things may be true, for they are not contrary to the scriptures; so it was expressly commanded, that the hands to be laid upon every victim should be those of the offerer himself, and not of any other person as his substitute.‖ On this subject it

* Ad Levit. viii. † In Maase Korban. c. 3.
‡ Levit. i. 4. iii. 2. 8. 13. iv. 4. 24. 29. § In Maase Korban. c. 3.
‖ Levit. i. 4. iii. 2. 13. iv. 4. 24. 29.

is said in the book Siphra;* 'And every one shall 'lay on his own hand, not the hand of his servant; 'his own hand, not the hand of his substitute; 'his own hand, not the hand of his wife.' This rule is understood by Maimonides† to admit of an exception in reference to the burnt offerings and peace offerings of a person deceased; who, after having selected the victims for voluntary sacrifices, had died before his design was carried into execution; for that those victims, being destined for the altar, were to be sacrificed according to the intention of the deceased, and the hands of his heir were required to be laid upon them. 'If any one 'happen to die, leaving a sacrifice behind him, whether a burnt offering or peace offering, his heir 'brings it to the altar, lays his hands upon its head, 'and also performs the libations;' that is, adds the proper quantity of wine, oil, and flour, appointed for such a victim. This writer further observes,‡ that the imposition of hands was to be performed,—on the burnt offerings and sin offerings, at the north side of the altar, which was the place where those victims were to be slain;§—and on the peace offerings, in any part of the sanctuary: and that every person, while laying his hands on the head of an animal about to be sacrificed, in any place, was to turn his face and eyes towards the west, or towards the temple. This was thought the more becoming, because every person, while laying hands on a victim, used to offer up some solemn prayers, which it was deemed improper to utter, except with the face directed towards the temple. Hence the following

* Vid. Korban. Aaron. c. 17. † In Maase Korban. c. 3. ‡ Ibid.
§ Levit. i. 11. vi. 25. vii. 2.

language of the same rabbi:* 'Let every person 'standing out of the land of Israel, say his prayers 'with his face turned towards the land of Israel. 'Let every person standing within the land of Israel, 'turn his face towards Jerusalem, towards the sanc-'tuary. Let every person standing in the temple, 'turn his face towards the inner sanctuary.' But the law, respecting imposition of hands on the heads of victims, is considered by the Jews as obligatory on none but male adults, Israelites by birth, and in the full possession of their bodily senses and mental faculties; so that women and boys, strangers and servants, men who were deaf and blind, and ideots, had no concern in this rite:†—a point which it is of no importance for us to discuss.

VII. The Jews are all of opinion, that imposition of hands was not required upon any sacrifices offered for the whole congregation, except only on the sin offerings; and as this opinion contradicts no law, so it sufficiently accords with the ancient and received custom. For when burnt offerings and sin offerings for all Israel were sacrificed at the command of Hezekiah, we read that the hands of the elders were laid upon the sin offerings,‡ but not upon the burnt offerings. But though imposition of hands was not practised upon any sacrifices of the whole congregation, except only the sin offerings, yet the Jews are not all agreed that this ceremony was necessary to be performed upon all victims of this kind. For some suppose,§ that this rite used to be employed on no sacrifice of the whole congregation, except the goat that was led away into the wilderness, and the

* In Tephilla Ubircath Cohan. c. 5. † Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 3.
‡ II Chron. xxix. 20—24. § Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 3.

bullock that was slain for a sin of ignorance.* But the advocates of this opinion are easily confuted; for the hands of the elders were laid upon the goats, which, as I have just mentioned, Hezekiah commanded to be sacrificed as a sin offering for all Israel. Hence other rabbies are of opinion†, that imposition of hands used to be practised on all sin offerings sacrificed for the whole congregation, whose blood was to be carried into the sanctuary. The number of elders employed in this ceremony, some affirm to have been three;‡ others, five;§ and others, twelve,‖ who were the princes of the tribes. On this point it is of no importance to contend, because more or fewer might equally represent the whole nation, and consequently might perform this rite in the place, and on the behalf, of all the people.

VIII. Imposition of hands was the customary mode of marking out and designating those persons which were either devoted to death, or commended to the divine favour, or destined to any important office or sacred service: and this rite was always accompanied by some express words adapted to the nature and design of the business in hand. Thus any one who had been guilty of blasphemy was devoted to death, by the hands of the witnesses laid upon his head¶, and, as Maimonides says,** with the following imprecation: 'Thy blood be upon thine own 'head; for thou hast perished according to thy 'desert.' The patriarch Jacob, laying his hands upon Ephraim and Manasseh, at the same time com-

* Levit. xvi. 21. iv. 15. † R. Simeon, apud lib. Siph. c. 6.
‡ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 3. Sectat. R. Simeon. in Siphra, c. 6.
§ R. Juda in Siphra, c. 6. ‖ Jonathan Targumist. ad Levit. iv. 15.
¶ Levit. xxiv. 14. ** In Avoda Zara, c. 2.

mended them both to God by his prayers.* And when Moses committed the government to Joshua with the same ceremony,† he doubtless implored for him an increased measure of divine inspiration, to qualify him for the discharge of so arduous an office. And, what is very important in the present inquiry, when the high priest laid his hands even upon an irrational animal, the goat that was to be led away into the wilderness, he at the same time confessed over that victim the sins of all the people, and imprecated upon its head the vengeance due to them.‡ Imposition of hands was never used without some form of supplication, or imprecation, or both: and hence solemn prayers are often included under the description of "laying on hands," even where no prayers are expressly mentioned.§ So this very law, which commanded the hand of the offerer to be laid upon a victim about to be sacrificed, must be considered as including a tacit command to offer up some prayers, by which the victim was to be consecrated. Thus Aaron Ben Chajim says:‖ 'Where 'there is no confession of sins, there is no imposition 'of hands; because imposition of hands belongs to 'confession of sin.' Maimonides also says:¶ 'Every 'person places both his hands between the two horns 'of the victim, and makes confession of sin over a 'sin offering, and of trespass over a trespass offer-'ing; and over a burnt offering he confesses those 'things which have been done against affirmative pre-

* Gen. xlviii. 14. 16. 20. † Num. xxvii. 18. 23. Deut. xxxiv. 9.

‡ Levit. xvi. 21.

§ Deut. xxxiv. 9. I Tim. v. 22. Heb. vi. 2. Matt. xix. 15. Mark v. 23, vi. 5. Luke iv. 40. xiii. 13. Acts viii. 18, 19. xix. 6.

‖ Ad Siphra in Dibur. Hachat. fol. 95. *Edit. Venet.*

¶ In Masse Korban, c. 3.

'cepts, or against negative precepts which are in-
'separable from affirmative ones.' The owner of every peace offering this rabbi supposes to have pronounced over his victim, not confessions, but praises.* 'Over peace offerings, I apprehend, he 'makes no confession of sin, but commemorates the 'praises of God.'

IX. It is highly probable, indeed, that the prayers which used to be pronounced over each victim, corresponded to the nature and design of that victim. Thus I should suppose that sin offerings and trespass offerings were chiefly accompanied by confessions of guilt, united with deprecations of punishment; voluntary offerings, by prayers for blessings; eucharistic and votive sacrifices, offered after prosperity enjoyed or dangers escaped, by praises and thanksgivings; and every kind of victims by such prayers as were most suitable to each. Yet every sacrifice, to whatever class it belonged, might duly and properly be accompanied by some confession of guilt and supplication for pardon; which would well become the best of men, whatever was the occasion of their sacrifices. The heathens connected various prayers, with their sacrifices, according to the different designs with which they were offered. 'That victims 'should be sacrificed without prayer,' says Pliny,† 'seems improper, and not duly reverential to the gods. 'Besides, there are various forms, of supplication, of 'deprecation, and of commendation.' Nor do I see any reason to doubt that the same custom was followed by the Jews. All the rabbies maintain the total inefficacy of any sacrifice to obtain the pardon of guilt, unless the person who offered it added his confessions

* In Maase Korban. c. 3. † Hist. Nat. L. xxviii. c. 2.

and supplications. Thus Abarbinel:* 'The wise 'men of blessed memory, have taught in the Talmud, 'that a confession of the crime committed was neces-'sary to be added to every sin offering.' And another,† speaking of a confession commanded in the law, says: 'This confession belongs to all sin offer-'ings.' The same is asserted by Aben Ezra,‡ and by Moses Ben Nachman.§ Maimonides‖ also inculcates the same, and that concerning trespass offerings, as well as sin offerings: 'The owners of sin 'offerings or trespass offerings, sacrificed for faults 'committed with or without knowledge, unless they 'repent, and confess their sins in express words, are 'not purged by their sacrifices; for it is said,¶ that 'he shall confess in what he has sinned.'

X. The rabbinical writings contain three forms of supplication, which used to be pronounced over victims about to be sacrificed. One of them was said by the high priest,** in confession of his own sins, and the sins of his family, over the bullock about to be slain as their sin offering, on the day of annual atonement.†† 'I beseech thee, O Lord; we 'have sinned, we have trespassed, we have rebelled 'in thy sight, I, and my family. O Lord, I beseech 'thee, forgive now the sins, trespasses, and rebellions, 'with which we have sinned, trespassed, and re-'belled, I, and my family. According as it is written 'in the law of Moses thy servant, where it is said. 'On this day there shall be an atonement for you, 'and a cleansing for all your sins, and ye shall be

* Ad Levit. xvi. † R. Abuav. ad Levit. v. 5. ‡ Ibid. § Ibid.
‖ In Teshura, c. 1. ¶ Levit. v. 5.
** Misn. in Joma. Siphr. in Achar. Maimon. in Jom. Hachip. c. 4.
†† Levit. xvi. 6. 11.

'clean before the Lord.' The second form,* pronounced also by the high priest over the same victim, differed from the first only in an addition, after the words *I and my family*, of these words, *and the whole house of Aaron.* This prayer of the high priest was followed by the other priests with this response: 'Blessed be the glorious name of his kingdom for 'ever and ever.'—The third form of deprecation was for any sinner offering a piacular sacrifice, who said it with his own mouth while his hands were laid upon the head of the victim:† 'I beseech thee, O Lord; 'I have sinned, I have trespassed, I have rebelled; 'I have——;' [*here the person specified the particular sin which he had committed, and for which he wanted expiation*] 'but now I repent, and let THIS 'be my expiation.' The concluding words evidently referred to the animal placed under the hands of the offerer, and are said by the Jews to have the following signification: Let this victim be substituted in my place, that the evil which I have deserved may fall on the head of my sacrifice.

XI. The Jewish books also contain two other forms of confession; of which one used to be said by the high priest in the name of all the people of Israel, over the goat that was to be led away into the wilderness on the day of atonement; and the other, by any penitent confessing sin without a sacrifice. The former was in the following terms:‡ 'I beseech 'thee, O Lord; thy people the children of Israel 'have sinned, trespassed, and rebelled in thy sight. 'O Lord, I beseech thee, forgive now the sins, tres-'passes, and rebellions, in which thy people the

* Levit. xvi. 6. 11. † Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 3.

‡ Misn. in Joma, c. 6. Siphr. in Achar. Maimon. in Joma, Hachip. c. 3.

'children of Israel have sinned, trespassed, and re-
'belled in thy sight. According as it is written in
'the law of Moses thy servant, where it is said, On
'this day there shall be an atonement for you, and a
'cleansing from all your sins, and ye shall be clean
'before the Lord.' The people followed this prayer with the same response as the priests: 'Blessed be the 'glorious name of his kingdom for ever and ever.' The other form is thus expressed:'* 'I beseech thee, 'O Lord; I have sinned, I have trespassed, I have 'rebelled; I have——' [*here the particular offence was named*] 'Now I repent and am ashamed of what 'I have done; nor will I ever return to it again.' They who confound this prayer with the third form cited in the preceding section, and suppose it to have been used over the piacular victims, which I find was the opinion of Grotius, are evidently mistaken. For, to pass over other considerations, this form does not contain the words, *and let this be my expiation*, with which the third form concludes: and this is the more important, because those words eminently show what is, as will appear in a subsequent chapter, the common opinion of the Jews respecting the design and efficacy of the piacular victims.—The more fully the circumstances of the sin were detailed, the better was the confession considered. Maimonides says: 'He 'who is frequent and long in confession, is worthy 'of praise.'

XII. The consecration of victims by prayers said just before they were slain, was also common among the heathens; but was not accompanied by the imposition of hands enjoined upon the Jews. Speaking of the Egyptians, Herodotus says:† 'This is

* Maimon. in Teshuva, c. 1. † In Euterpe.

'their mode of sacrificing: having brought the de-
'voted animal to the sacrificial altar, they kindle
'the fire, and then, after having poured the wine
'upon him near the temple, and invoked the god,
'they kill the victim.' Pliny, beside the passage quoted in the former section, says:* 'We see that
'magistrates of the highest rank have addressed the
'gods in certain prayers. And that no part may be
'omitted, or said out of its proper order, some one
'reads before from a written form, another officer
'is appointed to listen, and another to command
'silence.' Traces of this custom are found in the poets, as is observed by Vossius:† 'First the priest
'brought the victim to the altar, leading it with
'his hand. Then in a precomposed form of words
'he consecrated the sacrifice to the god. Seneca in
'Thyestes says: 'He is himself the priest; with a
'loud voice he chants the death-song in a fatal
'prayer. He stands before the altar, and the vic-
'tims devoted to death he himself seizes, places in
'order, and kills.' So Juvenal in his sixth Satire:
'He uttered the prescribed words, according to the
'custom.' The poet says, *prescribed words*, because
'they were always repeated after some one who read
'them from a written form, that nothing might be
'omitted or said out of its proper order. Another
'person was added, who was carefully to listen; and
'another, who was to command silence.' Other prayers used to be said after the killing of the victims, both by the Jews and by the Heathens: but they belong not to our present inquiry, which only respects those by which the victim when placed before the altar was to be consecrated and devoted.

* Hist. Nat. L. xxviii. c. 2. † De Theolog. Gent. L. ix. c. 8.

CHAPTER XVI.

The Killing of the Victims, the Sprinkling of the Blood, the Flaying, and the Manner in which the Victims were to be cut up.

IMMEDIATELY after the imposition of hands and the prayers connected with that ceremony, the victim was to be slain; and that in such a manner as for all the blood to flow into a vessel placed under its throat. This it was thought would be the case if the greater part of the gullet, windpipe, and jugular veins, were cut through at one stroke, or two at most, with a knife drawn forwards and backwards. In victims killed in a more lingering manner, it was supposed that fear would cause the blood to retire inwards, and there to stagnate.* Care was taken to prevent this, lest those who were to eat the flesh should be defiled by eating the blood. On this subject Maimonides says:† 'How does the killer of a victim proceed? 'Grasping with his hand the gullet, windpipe, and 'jugular veins, he holds those parts over the middle 'of a goblet, and cuts them through, or at least 'through the greatest part of them, so that all the 'blood may flow out into the vessel.' Wherefore to facilitate the slaughter, in the pavement of the court on the north side of the altar were fixed some rings,‡ with which the necks,§ or, according to others, the feet‖ of the victims used to be fastened. Among the heathens this was accounted an act of extreme impiety. On the north side of the altar were to be slain such victims, whether bullocks, sheep, or goats,

* Maimon. in Shechita, c. 3. † In Maase Korban. c. 4.
‡ Misna in Middoth, c. 3. § Bartenora in Middoth. c. 3. ‖ Maimon. ibid.

as were numbered among the *most holy sacrifices;* the burnt offerings, sin offerings, and trespass offerings. This was expressly commanded in the law.* And the peace offerings of the whole congregation being included, as we have already stated, in the same rank, they also were considered as required to be slain on the same side of the altar. But all the victims denominated *light* or *inferior sacrifices,* the peace offerings of individuals, the paschal victim, the firstlings, and the tithes, might lawfully be slain in any part of the court of the priests:† for there was no particular part of that court appointed in the law for this purpose. But all these things are to be understood of victims selected from quadrupeds, and not of birds. For birds were to be killed with the priest's nails at the horns of the great altar: and according to the Jews those which were designed for burnt offerings, at the north-eastern horn of it; and those which were for sin offerings, at the south-western horn. In the former the head was to be divided from the body,‡ which was never to be done in the latter.§

II. When the victim was killed, the blood was immediately to be sprinkled; but in different ways and in different places in different kinds of sacrifices. There were some victims, whose blood was to be carried into the tabernacle or temple. Such were all the occasional sin offerings of the whole congregation; the goat for the whole congregation, and the bullock for the family of Aaron, both slain on the day of atonement; and the bullock appointed as an occasional sin offering for the high priest.‖ Concerning

* Levit. i. 11. vi. 25. vii. 2. † Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 5.
‡ Ibid. § Levit. v. 8. ‖ Levit. iv. 16. xvi. 14, 15. iv. 5.

the rest of the sacrifices, it was commanded that the blood of some should be sprinkled on the horns of the great altar, and of others on its sides. When victims for sin offerings were taken from bullocks, sheep, or goats, some of the blood was to be put, by the priest's finger,* upon the horns of the great altar, and the rest of it was to be poured out at the bottom of that altar;† and this according to the rabbies, towards the south-western corner, where there were two holes through which it ran into a subterranean conduit, and thence into the brook Kidron.‡ The blood to be sprinkled on the sides of the altar, the rabbies say, was to be sprinkled, in some cases above the middle of the altar, and in others below it: wherefore, to prevent any mistake, the middle of the altar was encircled with a scarlet line.§ Above the middle was to be sprinkled the blood of those birds which were sacrificed as burnt offerings; and that of those which were designed for sin offerings, below it.‖ Below the middle of the altar, it is also said, was to be poured out the blood of all the victims, with which its sides were to be sprinkled; but not all in the same manner. The blood of the paschal lamb, of the male firstlings, and of the tithes, was considered as rightly sprinkled, if it were only poured out at either corner of the altar which had a base, or projecting foundation;¶ and there was this projection at every corner except the north-eastern.** But of burnt offerings selected from quadrupeds, of peace offerings, and

* The Jews say that the blood was to be sprinkled with the fore finger.

† Levit. iv. 25. 34. ‡ Misna in Middoth, c. 3. § Ibid.

‖ Maimon. in Maase Korban, c. 6. ¶ Ibid. c. 5.

** TR.—For some curious information concerning the traditions on this subject, the learned reader is referred to *Middoth, Bartenora, & L'Empereur, in Misna Surenhus.* tom. v. p. 348, 349. 353, 354.

trespass offerings, the blood was to be "sprinkled "round about upon the altar,"* or as the Jews understand these words, on all the sides of it. Hence in these sacrifices, it used to be sprinkled on two opposite corners, the north-eastern and south-western, in such a manner that two sprinklings wetted all the four sides. Whence those two sprinklings were called 'two sprinklings which are like four.'† The custom of pouring blood round an altar was also practised among the heathens: as appears from Lucian,‡ who introduces a priest as performing it.

III. This may suffice concerning the sacrificial blood that was to be sprinkled without the temple. There were other victims, as we have already stated, whose blood was commanded to be sprinkled within that edifice. And among these there was this difference: the blood of some was to be sprinkled only in the outer sanctuary, and that of others in both. Of the former kind were the bullocks that were slain as occasional sin offerings, either for the high priest or for the whole congregation;§ and also the goat which was commanded to be sacrificed for the whole congregation as an atonement for a sin of ignorance;‖ supposed by the Jews to be that of strange worship: this goat being, as Maimonides has justly observed, of the same kind of victims with those bullocks.¶ 'The law has not directed, how or where the blood 'of goats sacrificed to atone for strange worship was 'to be sprinkled. But these being sin offerings of 'the whole congregation, similar to the bullock offered 'for a sin of ignorance, all that is said of the one,

* Levit. i 5. iii. 2. 8. 13. vii. 2. † Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 5.
‡ De Sacrif. § Levit. iv. 3. 13. ‖ Num. xxiv. 15.
¶ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 5.

'relative to the sprinkling of the blood, the burning of 'carcass, and the defilement of persons employed in 'burning it, is equally applicable to the other.' Whenever any of these victims were slain, the blood was to be carried into the outer sanctuary, and was to be sprinkled with the high priest's finger, seven times towards the vail of the inner sanctuary, and then once upon each of the horns of the golden altar; after which all the remainder was to be poured out at the bottom of the great altar.*

IV. The blood of the young bullock slain as a sin offering for the family of Aaron on the day of atonement, and of the goat sacrificed on the same day as a sin offering for all Israel, the high priest was commanded to carry into the inner sanctuary.† First, he was to carry in the blood of the bullock, and with his finger to sprinkle part of it towards the mercy seat, according to the Jews, once upwards and seven times downwards; then to return to the outer sanctuary, and to sprinkle another part of the blood towards the vail of the inner sanctuary in the same manner as he had sprinkled towards the mercy seat, that is, once upwards and seven times downwards: after which he was to repeat all the same process with the blood of the goat. When these ceremonies were finished, the blood of both victims, it is said, was to be poured together into one vessel,‡ and some of it was to be sprinkled with the high priest's finger, once on each of the horns, and seven times on the top, of the golden altar;§ and the remainder was to be poured out at the bottom of the great altar. That the blood of both these victims was to be sprinkled towards the

* Levit. iv. 6, 7. 17, 18. † Levit. xvi. 14, 15.
‡ This is supposed to be implied in Levit. xvi. 18. § Levit. xvi. 18, 19.

mercy seat eight times, once upwards and seven times downwards, is asserted by Maimonides from tradition; *and is inferred from the scripture itself by Solomon Jarchi, who thus expounds the injunction of the law respecting this matter:† "And he shall "sprinkle with his finger; 'here is evidently one 'sprinkling:' "And before the mercy seat shall he "sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times;" 'that is once upwards and seven times downwards.' I understand the language of Moses‡ as directing the blood to be sprinkled not *upon* the mercy seat, but *towards* it; and this is also the opinion of the rabbies. Thus Bartenora:§ 'The drops of blood reach not to 'the mercy seat, but fall down upon the ground.' The same also is affirmed concerning the vail: 'He 'sprinkles not *upon* the vail, but *before* the vail.'‖ That the blood of these victims was to be sprinkled in the outer sanctuary towards the vail, the same number of times as in the inner sanctuary towards the mercy seat, is inferred from these words: "And 'so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congrega-'tion:"¶ which are thus expounded by Jarchi: 'As he 'sprinkles part of the blood of each victim in the inner 'sanctuary once upwards and seven times downwards, 'so he sprinkles it also in the outer sanctuary once "upwards and seven times downwards.' And the septenary number was frequently used in sacred rites.

V. And here it may be remarked on this appointment; that as God created the universe in six days, and rested on the seventh day, he not only commanded every seventh day to be kept sacred in memory of his creation of the world, but also enjoined a very frequent

* In Jom. Hachip. c. 8. † Ad Levit. xvi. 14. ‡ Levit. xvi. 14, 15.
§ Ad Joma, c. 5. ‖ In Gemara, ibid. ¶ Levit. xvi. 16.

use of the number seven in the ceremonies of his worship. Not to repeat what has been said of the victims last mentioned, the blood of the red heifer was sprinkled seven times towards the sanctuary. Whenever any person or house was to be purified from leprosy, oil or blood was to be sprinkled seven times. When the altar was dedicated, oil was sprinkled upon it seven times. The dedication of the altar was appointed to occupy seven days; the consecration of the priests, seven days; and the same number of days was often required for the removal of ceremonial impurity. Naaman was directed to wash himself seven times in the Jordan. At the command of God, Jericho was to be besieged for seven days, and on the seventh day to be encompassed by the besiegers seven times, preceded by seven priests blowing seven trumpets. Every seventh day was a sabbath of holy rest, every seventh year was a sabbatical year, and seven times seven years brought the year of Jubilee.* It would exceed all due bounds to enumerate every instance of this kind. But hence the number seven came to be employed by the Hebrews to denote perfection; and what is done very often, is commonly said to be done seven times.† But we must now return from this short digression.

VI. Of all the rites the sprinkling of the blood was the most sacred; because by that act the life of the victim was considered as presented to God the supreme lord of life and death. For as in this kind of worship every thing was thought to be presented to God, that was laid upon his altars; so the

* Gen. ii. 2, 3. Exod. xx. 11. Num. xix. 4. Levit. xiv. 16. 51. viii. 11. Exod. xxix. 37. 35. Levit. viii. 33. xiv. 8. xv. 13. 24. Num. xix. 12. 19. II Kings v. 10. 14. Josh. vi. 3, 4. Levit. xxv. 4. 8, 9, 10.

† Psal. xii. 6. Prov. xxiv. 16. xxvi. 25. Isaiah iv. 1. Jerem. xv. 9.

blood is the vehicle of the life, and is sometimes called *the life*,* so that to whomsoever the blood was presented, to him also was surrendered the life itself. Hence we learn how to understand the language of St. John: "I saw under the altar the souls of them "that were slain for the word of God, and for the "testimony which they held."† The souls here mentioned were those of persons who shed their blood as holy victims; and these souls are represented as seen under the altar, because the blood of victims used to be poured out, as we have already stated, at the bottom of the altar in the outer sanctuary. Those who understand this passage as alluding to the golden altar, which stood in the inner sanctuary, are evidently mistaken; because no sacrificial blood was ever poured out at the bottom of that altar: they are misled by a supposition that the scene of the apostle's vision was confined within the inner sanctuary, whereas it extended not only beyond that sanctuary, but also beyond the whole of the temple. But we must proceed to the other rites which demand our attention.

VII. After the sprinkling of the blood,—in burnt offerings consisting of birds, the rabbies tell us that the head was immediately to be sprinkled with salt, and laid upon the altar; then the feathers were to be plucked off, and the craw plucked out, and thrown among the ashes. In the next place the wings were to be wrenched out of their joints, but not severed from the body;‡ and lastly, the body was to be sprinkled with salt, and laid upon the hearth of the altar.§ The process was entirely different about birds that

* Gen. ix. 4. Levit. xvii. 14. † Rev. vi. 9. ‡ Levit. i. 16, 17.
§ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 6.

were sacrificed as sin offerings; of which the blood was the only part that belonged to the altar, as is correctly observed by Maimonides, when treating on this subject: 'The blood is the only part assigned 'to the altar: the rest is eaten by the priests and 'the sons of priests.' And therefore, that no sacrifice might ever be offered without some part being laid upon the altar, every bird immolated as a sin offering was to be accompanied by another for a burnt offering.*

In sacrifices consisting of quadrupeds, after the sprinkling of the blood, the next operation was to strip off the skin. To facilitate this operation, on the north side of the altar were erected eight stone pillars, connected by wooden beams, in each of which were fixed three rows of iron hooks;† so that the largest victims being suspended from the uppermost hooks, the smaller victims from the middle hooks, and the smallest victims from the lowest hooks, might be flayed with ease.‡ And at the passover, when the victims were more numerous than the hooks would accommodate,§ it is said to have been the custom to suspend the paschal lambs upon staves, which were placed each across the shoulders of two men. Rabbi Eliezer,‖ indeed, supposes that when the passover happened on the sabbath, those who flayed the lambs used their own arms as staves, lest the bearing of the staves should violate the rest of the sabbath. But this consideration has no weight with the wise men, who pronounce,¶ 'that the rest 'of the sabbath has no place in the sanctuary.' And

* Levit. v. 7. xii. 6. 8. xiv. 22. xv. 15. 30. Num. vi. 11.

† Misna in Middoth, c. 3. ‡ Bartenora, ibid.

§ Misna in Pesachim, c. 5. ‖ Ibid. ¶ Bartenora & Maimon. ibid.

to the same purpose is the language of Christ, "that "on the sabbath days the priests in the temple pro-"fane the sabbath, and are blameless.*

VIII. When the skin was stripped off, or while that operation was proceeding, the victim was to be cut up. This was differently performed in different kinds of sacrifices, but of all victims taken from quadrupeds the *select* parts were to be cut off. These, as Maimonides† has correctly stated from the law,‡ were not all the same in bullocks and goats as in sheep: 'In bullocks and goats the select parts 'were,—the fat that covers the intestines, including 'the fat of the breast; both kidneys, and their fat, 'with the fat that is on the flank; and the caul of 'the liver, with which is taken also a small piece of 'the liver itself. To these parts, when the victim is 'a sheep or lamb, is added the entire tail, together 'with the joints which reach even to the region of 'the kidneys. For it is said, The whole rump shall 'shall he take off hard by the back bone.' The tails of sheep in Syria, Pliny says,§ were generally very large, and loaded with a kind of fat; which I suppose was the reason of their being included among the parts that were to be solemnly burnt upon the altar. And as the parts just enumerated were to be cut off from all victims of the flock or herd; so these were the only parts that were commanded to be taken from any quadrupeds sacrificed as sin offerings, or from the peace offerings of the whole congregation; from the paschal victims, the firstlings, or the tithes. All the flesh of all these victims belonged, either to the offerers or to the priests; so that no

* Matt. xii. 5. † In Maase Korban. c, 5. ‡ Levit. iii.
§ Hist. Nat. L. viii. c. 48.

particular forms were required to be observed in cutting them up.

IX. From all the peace offerings of individuals the right shoulder was to be cut off together with the breast, and from the ram of the Nazarite the other shoulder also. These parts were first to be solemnly waved with the *select* parts, and then to be separated from them, and given to the priests for food.* The oblations of individuals on which this ceremony was performed, were delivered by the priest into the hands of the offerers, and then, by the hands of the priest placed under the hands of the offerers, were presented to God, by being waved in every direction. Maimonides says: 'How does the priest wave? He 'moves forwards and backwards, upwards and down-'wards. And if it be an eucharistic sacrifice, he 'places upon the breast, shoulder, and *select* parts, 'one of the ten wafers which ought to accompany 'the victim, and waves all these, as we have already 'stated, by the hands of the offerers. But how 'does he place them in the hands of the offerers? 'He puts the fat upon the hands of the offerers: 'on the fat he lays the breast and shoulder: next he 'places the two kidneys, and the caul of the liver: 'and if there are any unleavened wafers, he adds 'one of them; and waves all these things together. 'But if the sacrifice be the ram of a Nazarite, he 'he first takes out the *select* parts, next cuts off the 'breast and shoulder, and then boils all the rest in 'the court of the women. When this is done, the 'priest takes the sodden shoulder, and one of the 'ten wafers prescribed to be added to it, then the 'breast and the other shoulder *not sodden*, and lastly,

* Levit. vii. 30. Num. vi. 19, 20.

'the entrails, and waves them all by the hands of the 'Nazarite. For the priest, as we have already said, 'waves them all by putting his hands under the hands 'of the offerers.'

X. The burnt offerings taken from quadrupeds were to be cut up so as for the head, legs, shoulders, and all the other large members, of which we shall soon speak more particularly, to be severed from each other. The legs and entrails were to be washed in water.* Of this rite Maimonides says:† 'And 'they wash in water, because it is said; "His in-'wards and his legs shall he wash in water:" in water, 'not in wine pure or mixed, nor in other liquors; 'but every kind of water is allowed. But how much 'do they wash these parts? In the room allotted for 'that purpose, they wash the fat of the breast as 'much as is necessary; but the entrails, three times 'at the least. And these they wash on marble tables 'placed between the pillars.' To preserve the court, however, from being polluted with filth; they were always first washed in the room. 'The entrails, 'because they so abound in filth, are first washed 'privately in the washing room.'‡ This operation was repeated on the marble tables, from a belief that the cold of the marble would prevent the putrefaction of the entrails.§ Philo, in his usual manner, supposes the prescribed washing of the feet and entrails of victims to have conveyed important instructions:‖ 'Nor is it without mystery, that we are com-'manded to wash the feet and entrails. The washing 'of the entrails symbolically inculcates the necessity 'of being freed from unruly appetites, and purified

* Levit. i. 9. † In Maase Korban. c. 6. ‡ Tosaphoth ad Middoth, c. 3.
§ Bartinora ad Middoth, c. 3. ‖ De Animal. ad Sacrif.

'from the stains contracted by drunkenness and glut-
'tony, vices exceedingly pernicious to human life.
'The washing of the feet signifies that henceforth we
'ought to walk, not on the ground, but through the
'skies.'

XI. As soon as any victim was cut up, whatever was to be burnt on the altar used to be brought to its sloping ascent, and there to be sprinkled with salt. This was not the case with any part of the birds that were sacrificed as sin offerings; but of those birds which were designed for burnt offerings, the whole, as we have already stated, except the crop and entrails, was to be consumed upon the altar; and so, it is evident, was the whole of all other victims that were immolated as burnt offerings. For the custom, said to be practised by the Jews, of taking out and casting away among the ashes, a certain muscle corresponding to that which shrank in Jacob's thigh when he wrestled with the angel, was not authorized by any precept of the law. In all other sacrifices, the paschal victims, firstlings, and tithes, the sin offerings, trespass offerings, and peace offerings, nothing was to be burnt upon the altar beside the select parts; which consisted, as we have already said, of the fat, the two kidneys, and the caul of the liver, with a small piece of the liver itself. Grotius, adopting the opinion of the rabbies, represents the mystical sense of this ceremony to be, 'that the honour of
'God requires the mortification of the sensual appe-
'tites, the instruments of which are the fat, kidneys,
'and liver.'* It must also be observed, that the kind of fat which was to be burned on the altar, or what is commonly called the tallow, was among the un-

* Abarb. ad Levit. iii. 5. Baal Hatturim, ibid. Grotius ibid.

clean parts which the Jews were forbidden to eat, but they were allowed to eat all the rest of the fat. The two kinds of fat are distinguished by Rabbi Bechai,* one as being 'separate from the flesh, and 'and not covered by it as by a rind;' the other as 'not separate from the flesh, but intermingled with 'it.'† A little after he says: 'The separate fat is 'cold and moist, and has something thick and gross, 'which is ill digested in the stomach: but the fat 'which is united with the flesh, is warm and moist.' The latter every one was at liberty to eat; but any person who should eat the former was to be cut off from among the people.‡

XII. The burnt offerings of the whole congregation, when they were properly cut up, and the accompanying drink offerings and meat offerings, used to be carried to the sloping ascent of the altar, by a certain number of priests:—the dissected members of bullocks with their meat offerings and drink offerings, by twenty-four; of rams, by eleven; of lambs and kids, by eight.§ But the lambs for the daily sacrifice were carried to the altar, on different occasions, by nine, ten, or eleven, and sometimes by twelve priests.‖ When only nine were called to this duty, and that was always the number except on festivals, the first carried the head, the hinder right foot, and the fat; the second, the two fore feet; the third, the back bone, the caul of the liver, and both kidneys; the fourth, the neck and breast; the fifth, the two loins; the sixth, the entrails placed on a dish, with the legs laid upon them; the seventh, the meat

* Ad Levit. iii. † The former kind of fat he calls חלב and the latter שמן
‡ Levit. vii. 23. 25. § Misna in Joma, c. 2. Maimon. in Maase Korb. c. 6.
‖ Ibid. in Joma.

offering appointed to accompany the burnt offering; the eighth, the high priest's meat offering; and the ninth, the wine for the appointed drink offering.* These duties, as well as others in other cases, were always assigned to the priests by lot.† But these things are to be understood only of the burnt offerings of the whole congregation. The burnt offerings of individuals required no certain number of priests, nor were the services relating to them assigned by lot.‡ For it was not thought necessary to observe the same order in private sacrifices as in public ones.

XIII. The dissected members of the holocausts, being sprinkled with salt on the sloping ascent of the altar, or, as was customary at the feast of new moon, upon the altar itself,§ were then laid upon what the Jews call *the great pile*, without being placed in any particular order; but they were afterwards disposed in such a manner that, as far as possible, each part appeared on the altar, in the same situation relative to the rest as it occupied in the animal when alive.‖ That this was to be done, is concluded by the Jews from the following command: "And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the "parts, the head, and the fat, in order upon the "wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar."¶ The term *great pile* implies that other piles, or rows, or layers of wood, were also placed upon the altar: but respecting the number of them, what is said in the Mishna** concerning the day of atonement shows that the ancient rabbies were not agreed: 'Rabbi 'Meir says; on every other day there were four

* Misna in Tamid, c. 4. † Misna in Joma, c. 2.
‡ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 6. § Maimon. in Temidim Umosaph. c. 6.
‖ Idem in Maase Korban. c. 6. ¶ Levit. i. 8. ** In Joma, c. 4.

'layers of wood, and on this day five. Rabbi Jose 'says; On every other day there were three, and on 'this day four. Rabbi Jehuda says; On every other 'day there were two, and on this day three.' Maimonides* follows Rabbi Jose: 'Every day they make on 'the altar three piles of fire. The first is the great 'pile, upon which they lay the daily sacrifice, and 'also the other sacrifices. The second, which is 'made near the first, is the little pile; from which 'they take, in a pan, the fire for burning the daily 'incense. The third is only designed to fulfil the 'command for the preservation of the fire: for it is 'said; The fire shall ever be burning." *Levit.* vi. '13.' To these three piles he states, that on the day of atonement, 'for the ornament and honour of the 'altar,' they added a fourth.† But he rejects the fifth with which Rabbi Meir supposed the remains of the evening sacrifice used to be consumed on the following morning; and is of opinion, that those remains were laid early in the morning on the first pile.‡ Maimonides§ also states it to have been the custom, that to the fire which had first descended from heaven, and thenceforward been preserved upon the altar, other fire was daily added: 'Although 'fire descended from heaven, yet it was commanded 'to add some fire of our own; for it is said, "And 'the sons of Aaron the priest, shall put fire upon 'the altar." *Levit.* i. 7.' But I am rather inclined to think the true meaning of this precept to be, that it was unlawful for any one but a priest to lay fire afresh upon the altar, whenever it had been removed from it, as the scripture shows was the case

* In Temidin Umosaph. c. 2. † In Joma Hachip. c. 2.
‡ In Temidin Umosaph. c. 2. § Ibid.

when the people changed their stations in the wilderness; or was wholly extinguished, as it must have been when the temple was shut by Ahaz, and when it was destroyed by the Babylonians. For after these events no more fire descended from heaven, but it was laid on the altar by a priest; and the fire thus brought for consuming the sacrifices and burning the incense, was consecrated by the altar itself. And the only crime which caused the destruction of Nadab and Abihu, was, that they presumed to burn the incense with fire that had not been taken from the altar.*

* Levit. x. 1, 2. xvi. 12.

CHAPTER XVII.

Some Victims to be burned without the Camp: others to be eaten.

FROM the rites performed on the burnt offerings, we proceed to the other classes of victims, of which none but the *select parts* were burned upon the altar, as we have already stated. Of these victims, some were to be burned without the camp, and others were to be eaten. And those were to be burned without the camp, whose blood was to be carried into the sanctuary.* Of this description, as I have mentioned in the preceding chapter, were the occasional sin offerings of the whole congregation;† the goat for the whole congregation, and the bullock for the family of Aaron, both sacrificed as sin offerings on the day of atonement; and the bullock prescribed as an occasional sin offering for the high priest.‡ The act of burning these victims polluted the persons by whom it was performed. "And the bullock for the sin "offering, and the goat for the sin offering, whose "blood was brought in to make atonement in the "holy place, shall they carry forth without the camp; "and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their "flesh, and their dung. And he that burneth them "shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, "and afterward he shall come into the camp." But no person was excluded from the camp, and commanded to bathe his body and wash his clothes, except on account of some impurity.§ And though the words of the law now cited refer only to the

* Levit. 6. 30. Heb. xiii. 11. † Levit. iv. 21.
‡ Levit. xvi. 27. iv. 11, 12. § Levit. xv. 5. Num. xix. 8.

victims slain on the day of atonement; yet all the others on which the same rites were to be performed, whose blood was to be carried into the sanctuary and whose carcasses were to be burned without the camp, must certainly have had the same effect of defiling the persons who burned them. Hence the general conclusion, of the rabbies, 'that a victim whose blood 'is carried into the sanctuary defiles the garments of 'those who burn the carcass:'* and, it may be added, their persons also; for they were commanded not only to wash their clothes, but to bathe their bodies. The same was required of the person who burned the red heifer:† which was also a public expiatory sacrifice, resembling the occasional sin offerings of the whole congregation. For her carcass was to be burned, as theirs were, without the camp; and as their blood was to be sprinkled seven times *within* the sanctuary, so hers was to be sprinkled seven times *towards* the sanctuary.‡

II. If it be inquired why those victims whose carcasses were burned without the camp always defiled the persons by whom they were burned, no other reason can be assigned but that they were polluted themselves. Nor does it seem possible to imagine their pollution to have taken place in any other way than that of the emissary goat on the day of atonement; which, it is evident, was so defiled with the sins of the people transferred to him by a symbolical rite, as to communicate a similar contagion to the person who led him away: wherefore he also was commanded to bathe his flesh and wash his clothes before he returned into the camp.§ But these things

* Siphra in Acharemoth. † Num. xix. 8.
‡ Numb. xix. 3—5. § Levit. xvi. 21, 22. 26.

will come to be discussed more at large in another place. Let it be remarked here, that those victims, which during the travels of the people in the wilderness were to be burned without the camp, were afterwards to be burned without the city of Jerusalem, which as we have mentioned before, was considered as corresponding to the camp of Israel. On this subject Maimonides says:* 'There are three places 'for burning sacrifices. The first is in the sanctuary: 'there they burn the victims intended for holocausts, 'and the select parts of other victims, which are 'rejected from the altar, and those bullocks and goats 'in which any blemish has appeared, either before or 'after the sprinkling of the blood. The second is 'the mountain of the house: there they burn the 'goats and bullocks which are to be burned, if any 'blemish appears in them after they are brought 'out from the sanctuary: this place is called *bira*. 'The third, which they call the place of ashes, is 'situated without the limits of the city, and bears the 'same relation to the temple which a place situated 'without the camp of Israel had to the tabernacle of 'the congregation: in this place they burn the bullocks 'and goats which the law commands to be burned 'without the camp.'† And as these victims were the chief of all the piacular sacrifices, so they communicated a symbolical pollution to the persons by whom they were burned.

III. The same defiling quality was attributed to expiatory victims among the heathens. Porphyry says:‡ 'All theologists agree in this; that no part of 'any victims immolated in order to avert any evil is

* Ad Zebach. in Misna, c. 12. † Levit. iv. 12. 21. xvi. 27.
‡ De Abstin. L. ii. s. 44.

'ever to be eaten, but that lustrations are necessary. 'For no one, they say, should go into a city or into 'his own house, without having first washed his 'clothes and his body in some stream or fountain.'

IV. The victims whose flesh was to be eaten, were—all the peace offerings, all the trespass offerings, and all the sin offerings except those whose blood was to be carried into the sanctuary, with the paschal victims, the firstlings, and the tithes. But the flesh of these victims was not all allowed to be eaten by all persons, nor at all times and in all places. The sin offerings and trespass offerings, and the peace offerings of the whole congregation, were to be eaten by none but priests and the sons of priests, and by them, only within the sanctuary,* and when they were in a state of corporeal purity: a condition that was required of every person who partook of any of the sacrifices.† To the priests also were assigned—all the flesh of the firstlings, and the right shoulders and breasts of the peace offerings of individuals, to which was added the other shoulder of the ram of the Nazarite, and that sodden.‡ But all these are permitted to be eaten in any part of Jerusalem,§ not only by the priests and their sons, but also by their wives, and by their daughters who had not been married, or who had returned to their father's house in a state of divorce or widowhood, provided they had either no children at all, or none but those who had been begotten by a priest: ‖ in which I agree with Aben Ezra¶ in opposition to Maimonides.** The same privilege was

* Num. xviii. 9, 10. Levit. vi. 16. xxiii. 20. † Levit. xxii. 4. vii. 21.
‡ Num. xviii. 17, 18. Levit. vii. 33, 34. Num. vi. 19.
§ Deut. xii. 6, 7. 17. 26, 27. ‖ Num. xviii. 11. Levit. xxii. 12, 13.
¶ Ad Levit. xxii. 13. ** In Terumoth, c. 6.

granted to servants born in the house of a priest or purchased with his money, but not to hired servants or sojourners.* It may also be observed, though it does not in reality belong to the present subject, that every Israelite who slew any animal of the flock or herd, whether bullock, sheep, or goat, for food for his family, was commanded to give to the priests the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw.† For as a portion of every mass of dough prepared for the table was to be sent to the priests as servants in God's household,‡ so likewise of every animal of these species that was slain for common food. And this portion being taken from the mouth, shoulder, and stomach, is supposed to have been a mystical emblem 'signifying that words, actions, and appetites, ought 'to be consecrated to God.' This explanation has been offered by Abarbinel,§ and adopted by Grotius.‖

V. As the priests had the right shoulder and breast from the peace offerings of individuals, and from the ram of the Nazarite the other shoulder also, and that sodden; so the rest of the flesh was allotted to the offerers. This might be eaten by any Israelite, male or female, in any part of Jerusalem:¶ as might also the tithe cattle, which belonged wholly to the offerers; and the paschal victims, whether lambs or kids, of which not a bone was to be broken, but which were to be roasted with fire, and all eaten by various companies the same night, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs.**

The feasting of the offerers on the flesh of the peace offerings was a token of mutual friendship between them and God. For as a common table generally

* Levit. xxii. 10, 11. † Deut. xviii. 3. ‡ Num. xv. 20, 21.
§ Ad Deut. xviii. 3. ‖ Ad Levit. iii. 9. ¶ Deut. xii 6, 7. ** Exod. xii. 3—10.

indicates mutual concord between men, whence it became customary for persons who formed mutual covenants to eat and drink together; a ceremony which we find to have been employed in the covenants between Isaac and Abimelech, Jacob and Laban, the Israelites and Gibeonites:*—so those who fed on the sacrifices were considered as partaking of the altar, and using one and the same table with God. Hence the altar is called "the table of the Lord, and the "fruit thereof his meat;†" implying that those whom God made partakers of his altar, were connected with him by the ties of friendship. For the same reason, those who ate things that had been sacrificed to demons, which was the custom of the heathens, were considered as having fellowship with demons.‡

VI. As the allotment of the sacrifices to the offerers was a sign of federal friendship between them and God, it was provided that no person should eat of any animal which he offered as an expiatory victim; because in this kind of sacrifice he was considered as guilty before God, and therefore not qualified for sacred communion with him. Hence it was that the peace offering was always preceded by the piacular victim, whenever any person offered both these kinds of sacrifices on the same day.§ The design of this order was, that being purged by the piacular victim, and having again found favour with God, he might be admitted to a sacred feast on the peace offering. Besides, for persons who had been guilty of transgressions, and offered sacrifices in order to obtain their forgiveness, the most becoming state of mind would be repentance; and with repentance would

* Gen. xxvi. 28—30. xxxi. 46. Josh. ix. 14, 15. † Mal. i. 12.
‡ I Corinth. x. 20. § Exod. xxix. 14. 22. Num. vi. 14. 16, 17.

comport sorrow for sin and abstinence from all feasts, especially from those which were furnished by their own expiatory sacrifices. The same observation has been made by Grotius, who, speaking of the peace offerings, says:* 'On these, after the pouring out of 'the blood, the individuals who had offered them, and 'their wives and children, were permitted to feast, in 'token of friendship with God. This was not allowed 'in the meat offering, because that was among the 'priveleges of the priests; nor in the sin offerings or 'trespass offerings, lest there should be a rejoicing 'in guilt.'

VII. Having seen what victims were to be eaten, and by what persons and in what places; let us now inquire what space of time was allowed for eating them. This was not the same in all cases. The votive and voluntary sacrifices might be eaten on the same day on which they were offered, and on the next day.† The same time has been fixed by the rabbies for the consumption of the tithe cattle and the first-lings.‡ But they are of opinion that the paschal victim,§ the ram of the Nazarite, and eucharistic sacrifices,‖ with the sin offerings and peace offerings of the whole congregation, were to be eaten only on the day on which they were slain, or at least before the following morning: and they consider the remains of the meat offerings as having been subject to the same regulation.¶ Here I apply the term *eucharistic* only to those victims, which were the spontaneous oblations of individuals on account of prosperity enjoyed, and which are designated in the law as sacrifices of thanksgiving.** I make this observation,

* In Levit. iii. † Levit. vii. 16. ‡ Maimon. in Maase Korban. c. 10.
§ Exod xii. 8. 10. ‖ Levit. vii. 15. ¶ Maimon. ubi supra. ** Levit. vii. 12.

because the paschal victims, the firstlings, and the tithes, with peace offerings which used to be immolated at the solemn feasts, may in some sense be numbered among the eucharistic sacrifices, as we have already remarked.

VIII. The short space of time within which the victims might be eaten, seems to have been designed to prevent any corruption of the sacrifices, and to guard against covetousness in any of the offerers or priests. This is the opinion of Philo:* 'Only two 'days are allowed for eating the peace offerings; no 'part of them is to be left to the third day, and that 'for several reasons. One is, that every thing ought 'to be laid on the sacred table in season, and care 'should be taken that nothing is spoiled by length of 'time; for the nature of animal food, even though 'it has been seasoned, is liable to putrefaction. An-'other is, that the sacrifices are not to be hoarded 'up, and afterwards dispensed to those who need 'them: for they belong not to the offerer, but to him 'to whom they have been offered; who, being bene-'ficent and bountiful, admits the offerers of the 'sacrifice to a participation of the altar and a feast 'with him at one common table, which he forbids them 'to call theirs: for they are ministers, and not foun-'ders, of the banquet. He is the founder of the feast, 'to whom the provision belongs, and whose bounty it 'is unjust to conceal by a preference of vile and sor-'did covetousness to the noble virtue of humanity.' Whatever remained of the sacrifices after the time appointed was to be wholly consumed by fire.†

IX. But short as was the time allowed for eating the votive or voluntary sacrifices, the time allotted for

* De Victimis, † Levit. vii. 17.

the eucharistic victims was still less. These, being offered for good already received, were on that account to be used with more liberality, and to be prepared for immediate banquets for the offerers and their pious friends. This was the reason why the eucharistic sacrifices were to be accompanied by bread of every sort;* that being one of the requisites for a feast. Philo says:† 'The law commands this victim 'to be all eaten, not as the former peace offering in 'two days, but in one; that those who have enjoyed 'speedy and timely benefits, may readily and without 'delay impart to others.' The same opinion is given on this subject by Abarbinel.‡

* Levit. vii, 12, 13. † De Victimis. ‡ Ad Levit. vii.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Nature and Design of a Sacred Type. Which of the Jewish Sacrifices the Principal Types of the Sacrifice of Christ.

THE preceding explication of the Jewish Sacrifices, as considered in themselves without reference to the Sacrifice of Christ, brings us to the remaining part of our subject, which divides itself into two branches. We have to inquire,—first, which of the sacrifices as types, in a more eminent degree than the rest, prefigured the sacrifice of Christ as the antitype:—secondly, what there was in all the Jewish Sacrifices, especially in those which more peculiarly typified the Sacrifice of Christ, from which we may learn the proper efficacy, and the true nature and design, of his Sacrifice.

To facilitate our investigation of the first of these topics, we shall make some preliminary remarks,—shewing the nature of a type; explaining how a type differs from a simile, and from symbols in general; and comparing the type and the antitype with each other.

A Type, in the theological sense of the term, may be defined as a symbol of something future, or an example prepared and evidently designed by God to prefigure that future thing. What is thus prefigured, is called the Antitype.

The first characteristic of a type is its adumbration of the thing typified. One thing may adumbrate another,—either in something which it has in common with the other; as the Jewish victims by their death represented Christ who in the fullness of time was to die for mankind:—or in a symbol of some property

possessed by the other; as the images of the cherubim placed in the inner sanctuary of the temple beautifully represented the celerity of the angels of heaven, not indeed by any celerity of their own, but by wings of curious contrivance, which exhibited an appropriate symbol of swiftness:—or in any other way in which the thing representing can be compared with the thing represented; as Melchizedec the priest of the most high God represented Jesus Christ our priest. For though Melchizedec was not actually an eternal priest, yet the sacred writers have attributed to him a slender and shadowy appearance of eternity, by not mentioning the genealogy or the parents, the birth or death, of so illustrious a man, as they commonly do in the case of other eminent persons, but, under the divine direction, concealing all these particulars.

The next requisite to constitute a type, is, that it be prepared and designed by God to represent its antitype. This forms the distinction between a type and a simile. For many things are compared to others, which they were not made to resemble for the purpose of representing them. For though it is said that "all "flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the "flower of grass,"* no one can consider the tenderness of grass as a type of human weakness, or the flower of grass as a type of human glory. The same remark must be applied to a metaphor, or that species of simile in which one thing is called by the name of another. For though Herod from his cunning is called *a fox*,† and Judah for his courage *a lion's whelp*,‡ yet no one supposes foxes to be types of Herod, or young lions types of Judah. The reason of the difference is, that these resemblances were not

* I Pet. i. 24. † Luke xiii. 32. ‡ Gen. xlix. 9.

formed with the design that one should be represented by the other.

Our definition of a type includes also, that the object represented by it is something future. In this we follow the sense in which the word has long been used, and the scripture also, which exhibits nothing as a sacred type but what by divine appointment represented something future. Those institutions of Moses which had the nature of types are called "a "shadow of things to come:"* and those things which "happened unto the fathers for types," are said to have been "written for our admonition, upon whom "the ends of the world are come."† In the same sense the Mosaic law, which abounded with numerous types, is declared to have had "a shadow of good "things to come."‡ And those things, which by the command of God were formerly transacted in the tabernacle, are described as prefiguring what was afterwards to be done in the heavenly sanctuary.§ Hence it appears that a type and a symbol differ from each other as a *genus* and *species*. The term *symbol* is equally applicable to that which represents a thing past, or present, or future; whereas the object represented by a *type* is invariably future. So that all the rites which signified to the Jews any virtue that they were to practise, ought to be called symbols rather than types: and those rites, if there were any, which were divinely appointed to represent things both present and future, may be regarded as both symbols and types; symbols, as denoting things present; and types, as indicating things future.

II. In comparing the type with the antitype, the first thing to be observed is, that the antitype succeeds

* Col. ii. 17. † I Cor. x. 1. 11. ‡ Heb. x. 1. § Heb. ix. 11, 12. 23, 24.

the type and removes it from its place, so that, as soon as the antitype comes, there can no longer be found any room or use for the type. The next and principal thing to be remarked is, the difference between the type and antitype; that the efficacy which is really possessed by the antitype, exists in the type only in appearance, or in a much lower degree. For though a type, as we have already stated, often possesses some quality in common with its antitype, yet that quality is always considerably weaker in the type than in the antitype; as the death of those victims by which the Messiah's death was prefigured, had far less efficacy with God and men, than what belongs to the death of Christ. The efficacy of the thing adumbrating was nothing more than a symbolical representation of the value contained in the thing adumbrated, or so slender a degree of it that it could only be considered as a shadow. Hence the apostle says:* "For the law, having a shadow of good things "to come, and not the very image of the things, can "never, with those sacrifices which they offered year "by year continually, make the comers thereunto "perfect." Here as he uses the phrase *the very image of the things* to denote the things themselves, so he declares the Jewish sacrifices, which were types of the sacrifice of Christ, to have had only a shadow of that efficacy of which his sacrifice possesses the reality. And this was the reason why those sacrifices never perfectly purified the persons by whom they were offered; as is evident from the language of the same apostle:† "For if the blood of bulls and goats, "and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, "sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much

* Heb. x. 1. † Heb. ix. 13, 14.

"more shall the blood of Christ, who through the "eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, "purge your conscience from dead works to serve "the living God?" The argument on which this inference proceeds, is, that the efficacy which was found only in a figure or in a very small degree in the type, is possessed in reality and in a far superior degree in the antitype. This is more expressly announced in a subsequent passage, which declares "the "patterns of things in the heavens" to have been "purified with" the sacrifices that were offered among the Jews, "but the heavenly things themselves with "better sacrifices."* Hence, as the shadow is opposed to the substance, or the representation of a thing to the thing itself, so the law of Moses, which enjoined many typical rites, is opposed to the gospel of Christ, which contains the things prefigured by those types. Thus when it is said, "The law was given by Moses, "but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ;"† the substance of the things themselves exhibited in the gospel is opposed to the typical shadows of the law. This principle is asserted in another place:‡ "Let "no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, "or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, "or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of "things to come: but the body is of Christ." On this passage St. Jerome remarks: 'There is therefore 'no judgment in this which is a shadow and ceased 'on the coming of the substance, because where the 'truth is present there is no need of a figure.' And Photius: 'The body is of Christ, that is the truth.' This may be confirmed by what the apostle had said just before: "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the

* Heb. ix. 23. † John i. 17. ‡ Col. ii. 16, 17.

"godhead bodily:" for Augustine has well explained this substantial inhabitation of the fullness of the godhead, as opposed to the figurative manner in which it dwelt in the Jewish temple.

III. As the true nature of a type consists in its adumbration of something future in whatever respect, so that it is of no importance whether it prefigures the efficacy of the antitype in something which it possesses in common with that antitype, or in a symbol or slight representation of something which exists in the antitype; we cannot admit the following argument of Socinus:* 'It is an egregious error, to 'take for granted that a type may be wholly destitute 'of that quality which it prefigures in the thing 'typified; which is manifestly false. For in the type 'there is always something of the same kind with 'that which it prefigures in the thing typified; though, 'if compared with that which it prefigures, it may 'seem opposed to it as an image to the reality. For 'example, the brazen serpent typified Christ; pre-'figuring his exaltation either on the cross or in 'heaven, and the salvation to be enjoyed by all who 'should believe in him. And the serpent itself was 'likewise exalted, and all who looked upon it were 'saved. In each of these cases, therefore, there was 'an exaltation, a looking, and a deliverance: but all 'more excellent in one than in the other.'

The design of Socinus in this reasoning was to persuade his readers, that no efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ was typified by any of the Jewish sacrifices, but such as those sacrifices truly and actually possessed: which whoever believes, will be very far from the truth. For what can be more evident, than that

* Prælect. c. 22.

a thing which represented another possessed only an image or symbol of the quality, and not the very quality itself, which it indicated in the thing represented? How was it with the images of the cherubim placed on the mercy seat? They certainly represented the celerity of angels, not, as we have already observed, by any celerity of their own, but only by the wings with which they were furnished as an appropriate symbol of swiftness, and without the reality. Nor did the sacred incense daily burned in the temple, which, as the scripture teaches us,* represented the prayers of the saints, possess any real quality in common with prayers. For its sweet odour, though sufficiently adapted to indicate how acceptable all pious prayers were to God, was not a quality of the same kind as that which it represented in those prayers. Nor can I discover what that looking towards the brazen serpent, which Socinus compares with faith in Christ as a type with its antitype, really and truly had in common with that faith. For though the looking of the eyes may in some respect be compared with the aspiration of the mind, yet I know nothing properly of the same kind (which Socinus requires in this case) that can be attributed to both. Let it also be observed, that the salutary efficacy which healed all who fixed their eyes on the brazen serpent, resided not in the serpent itself except only in a figure; whereas, on the contrary, the divine efficacy, which communicates eternal salvation to those who believe in Christ, actually resides in him: "for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead "bodily."† It is certain therefore that a type may prefigure its antitype, not only in something of the

* Rev. v. 8. viii. 3. 4. † Col. ii. 9.

same nature as what is found in the antitype, but even in a symbol or slight and shadowy image of such a thing, or lastly, in any thing that may in any respect be compared to that which it typifies.

IV. But though every type is formed and designed by God to prefigure something in its antitype, yet there is no reason why a thing which is clearly typical should not also have some other ends: for one and the same thing may have various ends, not at all inconsistent with each other, though relating to different objects. Suppose therefore, as Christian fathers and Jewish rabbies have united in maintaining, that one end for which sacrifices were enjoined upon the Hebrews after their departure from Egypt, was, that by being indulged with rites to which they had been previously accustomed, they might be more easily induced, and more firmly attached, to the worship of the true God: yet, nevertheless, another design of God in that economy may have been that those sacrifices should, as types, prefigure the sacrifice of Christ; especially as the sacrifices to which the people had been accustomed in Egypt, might be corrected and amended by some new rites and laws, so as to be much better adapted for this purpose. And this I apprehend was actually done, at least in those expiatory victims, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary, and whose bodies were burned without the camp. My reason for this opinion, it is not necessary to state in this place. From what has been already said, however, it follows that all those sacrifices, which were commanded in the law, and contained any thing designed to prefigure another thing in the sacrifice of Christ, were types of his sacrifice; notwithstanding those same sacrifices might also have

been commanded, in order that the people, thence forward transferring to the true God the rites to which they had long been accustomed, might by this means be the more easily confined to his worship.

V. It appears to me, therefore, that all the Jewish sacrifices may justly be regarded as types of the sacrifice of Christ. For as the death of every victim was adapted to prefigure the death of Christ, so the perfect purity of Christ, "who offered himself without "spot to God,"* was aptly represented by the unblemished perfection of body required in every victim; and that, even though the law which demanded this perfection, were likewise designed to indicate the perfect purity of him to whom only pure victims were to be offered, and to inculcate the sanctity necessary in those who offered them.

The apostle seems tacitly to compare all the different kinds of victims with the one sacrifice of Christ, as types with their antitype: "Wherefore when he "cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offer-"ing thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared "me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou "hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come "(in the volume of thy book it is written of me,) to "do thy will, O God. Above when he said, Sacri-"fice and offering and burnt offerings and offering "for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure "therein (which are offered by the law); then said "he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh "taketh away the first, that he may establish the "second. By the which will we are sanctified through "the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for "all."† The apostle certainly means, and the clause,

* Heb. ix. 14. † Heb. x. 5—10.

"He taketh away the first, that he may establish the "second," ascertains it beyond all doubt, that the sacrifice of Christ succeeded in the room of all the sacrifices which were "offered by the law:" and hence it was that when his sacrifice was accomplished they all ceased. This a thing so obvious that it is conceded even by Crellius himself. On the passage now cited he says: 'It might be asked, How does Christ's 'declaring that he would do the will of God in stead 'of the legal oblations, or his having actually per-'formed that will, affect us, or the expiation of our 'sins? The author shows, that this will of God and 'its execution consists in the sacrifice and oblation 'of Christ on our behalf: whence also it is tacitly 'compared with sacrifices and oblations, and is at 'the same time opposed to them, as far more excellent 'and more acceptable to God.' Here, then, is an admission, that Christ was to do the will of God instead of the legal sacrifices, and that he was to offer himself to God in the room of these sacrifices: and consequently, the sacrifice of Christ must have succeeded in the room of all the legal victims (for this language now cited refers to them all) even according to the opinion of Crellius himself. As the sacrifice of Christ, therefore, succeeded in the room of all the victims that were to be offered according to the law, and removed them all from their place, and as it far excelled them all, it seems reasonable to consider them all as types of this sacrifice, and this one sacrifice as the antitype of them all. For the mutual relation of type and antitype is sufficiently conspicuous in any two things, of which the latter succeeds by divine appointment in the room of the former, possessing moreover that efficacy of which

the former had only an image, or a very small degree; especially when there is so great a resemblance between those two things, as between all the Jewish victims and the sacrifice of Christ.

VI. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that those victims, whose carcasses were to be burned without the camp, were types of Christ, and that in a more eminent degree than the rest. For beside those things in which they prefigured Christ in common with the rest, such as their unblemished perfection and death; all these victims were piacular, as was also the sacrifice of Christ. And what deserves peculiar attention, they more eminently typified the sacrifice of Christ by the very circumstance of their being commanded in the law to be burned without the camp. Hear the language of the apostle: "We have "an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which "serve the tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, "whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the "high priest for sin, are burned without the camp. "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the "people with his own blood, suffered without the "gate."* There would be no force in this argument respecting the place where it was requisite that Christ should suffer death, unless all the victims whose blood was to be carried into the sanctuary had typified his sacrifice. For though those victims were burned without the camp, it could not be necessary on this account that Christ should die without the city of Jerusalem, which was evidently considered as corresponding to the camp in the wilderness; but in order to produce a greater resemblance between those victims and Christ: which however was not at all required

* Heb. xiii. 10—12.

except between types and antitype. Hence it follows, that all the victims, whose carcasses were burned without the camp, were types of the sacrifice of Christ, and that in a more eminent degree than any other victims, because they prefigured not only his death, but also the place where it was to happen.

Some persons suppose that the passage just quoted has an exclusive reference to those victims whose blood was to be carried into the inner sanctuary; but this is a great mistake. For the apostle is speaking of all the piacular victims of which even the priests themselves were not permitted to eat; as is evident from these words: "We have an altar, whereof they "have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." But this description includes all the victims whose blood was to be carried into either sanctuary.

Those victims whose blood was to be carried into the inner sanctuary, and whose carcasses were to be burned without the camp, evidently typified, not only the death of Christ, and the place where it should happen, but also his entrance into heaven. Hence the apostle says: "But Christ being come an high "priest of good things to come, by a greater and "more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that "is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood "of goats and calves, but by his own blood," differently from the Jewish high priest; "he entered in "once into the holy place, having obtained eternal "redemption for us."* In this passage, the Jewish high priest, and Jesus Christ our high priest; the blood of goats and calves, of those certainly which were sacrificed on the annual days of atonement, and the blood of Christ; the inner sanctuary and the

* Heb. ix. 11, 12.

highest heavens; and, what I have just mentioned, the entrance of the high priest into that sanctuary by the blood of those victims, and the entrance of Christ into heaven itself by the efficacy of his own blood; are compared with each other as types and antitypes.

VII. Nothing can be further from the truth, therefore, than what is confidently asserted by Socinus,* that the sacrifice of Christ was not typified by any piacular victims, but those which were sacrificed at stated seasons, and for the whole congregation. For among these very victims whose blood was to be carried into the inner sanctuary, and whose carcasses were to be burned without the camp, were the two bullocks which were to be offered, neither of them at stated seasons, but both as occasional sin offerings, one for the whole congregation, and the other for the high priest alone.† The same remark, as I have already stated, may also be applied to the goat which was to be sacrificed as a sin offering for the whole congregation, whenever the people through ignorance forsook the rites of their fathers for those of the heathens.‡ It is a further confirmation of our argument, that when the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is treating of those very victims which he represents as the most eminent types of the sacrifice of Christ, such as those whose blood was carried into the inner sanctuary, he always joins calves or bulls with goats.§ But those calves or bulls whose blood was carried into the inner sanctuary were offered, not for the whole congregation, but only for Aaron and his family, as we have before observed.

* Prælect. c. 22. † Levit. iv. 3—21. ‡ Num. xv. 22—24.
§ Heb. ix. 12, 13. x. 4.

But Socinus argues, that as Christ offered himself for all mankind, 'no piacular victims could so pre-'figure his sacrifice, as that the thing typifying 'should correspond to the thing typified, except those 'which were offered for the whole congregation 'of Israel.' As if frivolous subtleties ought to be opposed to the plain language of the scriptures, and that by one who has adduced nothing from them to shew wherein any of the piacular victims were typical of the sacrifice of Christ. But that none may conclude this notion of Socinus to be incapable of refutation,—suppose it impossible to have been typified by the sacrifices of individuals, that Christ would die for all mankind; yet his death itself, the place where it was to happen, the piacular efficacy of his death, and his spotless purity, might all be typified by those sacrifices. Indeed all these things were really typified by the piacular victims which were offered for the high priest: and the sacrifice of the bullock, which was offered for the family of Aaron on the day of atonement, was attended with rites, which, as we have already remarked, evidently prefigured Christ's entrance into heaven. Many other things, alike injudicious and unscriptural, might be adduced from Socinus and his followers, respecting the types of the sacrifice of Christ. But it is unnecessary to pursue this argument any further; because those things which conduce to a right understanding of the sacrifice of Christ, which is the design of the remarks contained in this chapter, will nevertheless remain in full force, even though his sacrifice had been typified by none of the Jewish sacrifices, except those which the law required to be offered for the whole congregation, and that, to say nothing of other stated seasons, only on the day of annual atonement.

CHAPTER XIX.

Proofs that the Efficacy of all the Sacrifices primarily and properly had respect, not to Men, but to God.

HAVING ascertained which of the sacrifices as types, in a more eminent degree than the rest, prefigured the Sacrifice of Christ as the antitype—which was the *first* object of examination proposed in the preceding chapter; we proceed, in the *second* place, to inquire, what there was in all the Jewish sacrifices, especially in those which more eminently typified the sacrifice of Christ, from which we may learn the proper efficacy, and the true nature and design, of his sacrifice. And these are discovered principally in two things. The first is, that the efficacy of all the victims properly had respect to God. The second is, that vicarious punishment was inflicted on the piacular victims. The first of these things indicates, that the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice primarily and properly had respect, not to men, but to God: the second teaches us, that Christ suffered a vicarious punishment for our sins.

Those who have but a slight acquaintance with this subject, know that both these principles are denied by Socinus and his followers. Socinus admits, indeed, that God would not pardon a sinner without an expiatory sacrifice duly offered; as is thus stated by Crellius:* 'If you affirm, that God was induced 'by sacrifices to refrain from punishing sins, only in 'this sense, that he would not remit the punishment, 'but on the performance of this condition; Socinus 'readily acknowledges the same: for he maintains

* Contra Grot. e. x. p. 10.

'that the oblation of victims contained a certain 'degree, though a small one, of obedience rendered 'to God, which according to the divine promise was 'followed by the forgiveness of some little errors and 'sins.' But all these things appear to be at variance with the scriptures, or to omit that which chiefly required explication. For the language which Crellius here ascribes to Socinus, fully implies, that the obedience of the offerer, consisting in this oblation of the prescribed victim, was the sole condition, which according to the promise of God, was followed by forgiveness of sin. But this is a very different representation of the piacular sacrifices, from that which is given in the scriptures: which attribute the expiation of sin, not so much to the obedience of the offerer, though that was not to be overlooked; as to the blood of the sacrificed victim. "For," God himself declares,* "it is the blood that maketh an "atonement for the soul." Besides, there are two kinds of obedience due to God, of which one properly has respect to God, such as that which is rendered in solemn prayers; and the other has respect to men, such as the duties which men perform towards each other according to God's command: but Socinus has not stated to which kind of obedience the oblation of victims ought to be referred, though this was most necessary to be determined. For if it belonged to the first kind, and this must be fully admitted, unless it be maintained that in sacrificial oblations men offered their victims one to another; it is manifest, that the efficacy of all the sacrifices, like that of solemn prayers and thanksgivings, had respect to God. And the same judgment must be formed

* Levit. xvii. 11.

of the sacrifice of Christ as of all others, unless it be thought proper to abstract from his sacrifice that which belonged to all the sacrifices by which it was typified, and which is included in the true nature and design of every sacrifice. But this is a digression from the point immediately under consideration, to which we must now return.

II. In asserting the efficacy of all the legal sacrifices to have had respect, primarily and properly, not to men, but to God, I would not be understood as concluding that efficacy to have been such as by its own value or extent to procure the favour of God towards the offerers. Our present inquiry is, not how great the efficacy of the sacrifices was, but, as I have already said, to whom it primarily and properly had respect. And all I now contend for, is, that they clearly had the same object as solemn prayers and thanksgivings addressed to God; which equally have respect to God, whether they obtain from him any great favour, or none at all. And this is so true, that even the prayers of the wicked, which are declared to be an "abomination,"* nevertheless have respect to God, as much as those which are offered by the most pious of men, and are most efficacious at the throne of grace.

III. Having sufficiently explained our first proposition, that the efficacy of all the Jewish sacrifices primarily and properly had respect to God, we must endeavour to prove it. And our first consideration shall be on the nature and design of the place where the law directed the Jewish sacrifices to be offered. That was, first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple at Jerusalem, which was built with the same design,

* Prov. xxviii. 9.

used for the same purposes, and distinguished by the same sanctity. Both were consecrated by the luminous cloud, which exhibited a symbolical representation of the peculiar presence of the Divine Majesty. Each was erected for the express purpose of being the residence of God, and that by his own command: which is no where said in the scriptures of any other place in the world. Persons who entered the sanctuary were described as appearing before God, and what was transacted there was considered as done before him. There it was his will to be approached and consulted; and towards that place were Israelites, when exiled or travelling in foreign lands, to direct their invocations; as we find Daniel did in Babylon. All these things indicated God's special presence in the sanctuary. And hence it may be inferred that sacrifices, being offered in that place which God himself had chosen to dwell in among his people, and had consecrated by his own presence, were sacred victims presented to God on behalf of the people. For there was no other reason why they should be offered in the sanctuary, than because they were offered to the Inhabitant of the sanctuary; nor could they be offered to him, without having respect to him, or without his being the object of their efficacy, how small soever it might be; in like manner as of solemn prayers, and thanksgivings which are addressed to him. There were some victims whose blood, on the day of atonement, was to be carried into the inner sanctuary. For what purpose can we suppose the blood to have been carried into the most sacred part of the divine residence, and that on the day of atonement, except to obtain the favour of him in whose presence it was sprinkled. Nor will any

of the other sacrifices lead us to a different conclusion. For the whole sanctuary was designed for the performance of religious rites and services, in duly performing which persons approached to God, and rendered a sacred worship, of which it cannot be doubted that he was the object. But we shall soon have to discuss this point more at large. Let it only be added here, that all the services commanded to be performed in the sanctuary, were prayers and sacrifices; and hence it is called "an house of prayer,"* and "an house of sacrifice."† When the law was solemnly read before all the people every seventh year,‡ it was not in the sanctuary itself, but in the court of the women.§

IV. The conclusion which is sufficiently authorized by the place appointed for the oblation of sacrifices, derives increasing evidence from the priestly office. God himself described this office when he said to Moses: "And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, "and consecrate them, that they may minister unto "me in the priest's office."‖ Hence it follows that to execute the sacerdotal office was the same thing as "to minister unto God:" and "to minister unto "God," is to perform a service which properly has respect to God. This is evident from the expression itself, and also from another passage of scripture: "These are the sons of Zadok, which come near to "the Lord to minister unto him."¶ Hence it is evident, that the priests drew near to God when they ministered unto him, or, in other words, when they offered sacrifices according to the law; and conse-

* Isaiah lvi. 7. † II Chron. vii. 12. ‡ Deut. xxxi. 10, 11.
§ Maimon. in Chagiga, c. 3. ‖ Exod. xxx. 30. xxviii. 41. xxix. 44. xl. 13. 15. ¶ Ezek. xl. 46. xliv. 15, 16.

quently that those sacrificial services had respect to God. The phrase *to come* or *draw near to God*, which the scriptures often designate the work of a priest,* is sometimes used to denote praying to God;† the only reason of which is, that solemn prayers and thanksgivings, as well as sacrifices, have respect to God.

Let it also be observed, that the principal difference between the priestly office and the prophetical, and even the apostolical, was, that prophets and apostles were to transact the business of God with men, but priests that of men with God. Prophets and apostles were ambassadors of God to men; priests were advocates of men with God. The former is taught by St. Paul, when speaking of himself and the other apostles: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."‡ The latter is evinced in the epistle to the Hebrews: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins."§ Here, to be "ordained for men in things pertaining to God," is the same as to transact the business of men with God; and to transact the business of men with God, is no other than "to offer to God both gifts and sacrifices for sins."

V. To this argument Crellius‖ objects the language of the apostle himself;¶ "I have therefore whereof I may glory in those things which per-

* Exod. xix. 22. Levit. x. 3. xxi. 21. Ezek. xl. 46. xliv. 15, 16.
† Isaiah xxix. 13. Heb. vii. 25. x. 22. ‡ II Cor. v. 20.
§ Heb. v. 1. ‖ Contra Grot. c. x. p. 3. ¶ Rom. xv. 17.

"tain to God."* But this expression is employed by the apostle, because in the verse immediately preceding he had metaphorically transferred to himself that which properly belongs to a priest. He had described himself as "ministering the gospel of God, "that the offering up of the Gentiles might be ac-"ceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit." Here he first represents himself as a sort of priest or chief minister of sacrifices, presenting to God as a sacred oblation, the people whom he imbued with the christian faith and holiness: and then having by this metaphorical mode of expression constituted himself a sort of priest, he proceeds to assume and claim to himself what belongs to a priest; saying "that he also hath whereof to glory in things per-"taining to God." But when he speaks thus of himself under the character of a priest, he also speaks of his work as having respect to God. For he declares, that the conversion of the Gentiles would be an offering acceptable to God. Thus the same thing that he calls *an offering*, he also represents as *acceptable* to God, and its efficacy as having respect to God.

But the work of him who converts men, it will be argued, must terminate on the persons whom he converts. To this we reply, that the apostle here, not only refers to the conversion of men by his ministry, but likewise suggests, that by converting them he consecrated them to God, presenting them as acceptable to him, and performing a work that was pleasing in his sight: so that as far as he assumed the character of a priest, so far he shews the efficacy of his work to have had respect to God.

* TR.—The original words here are the same as in Heb. v. 1. Τα προς τον Θεον.

But though St. Paul, by the use of metaphorical expressions, exhibits himself under the character of a priest, and though all Christians, on account of those spiritual sacrifices, which they daily offer to God, are sometimes called priests; yet it deserves our particular notice, that no ministers of the gospel, of any rank, are any where in the scriptures, on account of their office, called priests or high priests. This I remark, in order to shew that there is a great difference between the evangelical ministry, and the Aaronic priesthood; and that principally in this, that the former was appointed for God with men, the latter for men with God. Consequently, the latter chiefly respects God, and the former, men. Let it further be observed, that the Jewish priesthood was succeeded, not by the evangelical ministry, but by the priesthood of Christ: so that there now remains no divinely constituted priest or high priest, that is, no advocate for men with God, except Christ himself.

To approach to God on behalf of the people, and to commend them to him, being an office in the highest degree sacred and honourable, it was therefore directed in the law, that great attention should be paid to the qualifications of the priests in respect of parentage and marriage, purity of character and perfection of body. For the same reason it was commanded, that no priestly function should ever be performed by any one of another race; by any one impure, or maimed, or having any corporeal blemish; with unwashed hands or feet, immediately after drinking wine, or without the appointed garments, or with the head uncovered. For the same reason it was that Aaron and his sons were originally consecrated to the priesthood, with a long process of solemn and

select ceremonies. For they were first purified with water, then invested with the sacred garments, afterwards anointed with the holy oil, and commended to their God by various sacrifices. The design of all this is evident from the language of God to Moses already cited:* "And thou shalt put them" (the sacred garments) "upon Aaron, thy brother, and "his sons with him; and shalt anoint them, and con-"secrate them, and sanctify them, that they may "minister unto me in the priest's office:" which is as though God had said, So shall they come into my sanctuary to minister unto me, so shall they offer sacrifices to me on behalf of the people, and commend the people themselves to my regard, provided they shall have been duly consecrated, and deformed by no blemish.

VI. The next thing that we must notice, is the selection of victims that was to be practised among the Jews. For they were not permitted to sacrifice every species of animals which might lawfully be used for human food; nor, of those species which were allowed for the altar, any one that had the least blemish. The reason of this selection was, that sacrifices were among those services which were designed, either to commemorate and retain, or to conciliate, the divine favour. God says:† "Whatsoever hath a "blemish, that shall ye not offer; for it shall not be "be acceptable for you. And whosoever offereth a "sacrifice of peace offerings unto the Lord to ac-"complish his vow, or a free-will offering in beeves "or sheep, it shall be perfect to be accepted." Accepted by whom? Surely by God, to whom it was to be offered. Whatever, therefore, was required to

* Exod. xxviii. 41. † Levit. xxii. 20, 21. Deut. xvii. 1.

be perfect, that it might be accepted by God, its efficacy, as may easily be inferred, properly had respect to God. This is evident also from the language of God by Malachi:* "And if ye offer the "blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? And if ye offer "the lame and sick, is it not evil? Offer it now "unto thy governor: will he be pleased with thee, or "accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts." Here it is implied, that every sacrifice offered to God is like something presented to a king. But for what purpose is any thing presented to a king? It is certainly designed, either to obtain his favour, or to return thanks for it. The design of sacrifices, therefore, was the same; either to conciliate or to commemorate the divine favour: and in both cases their efficacy properly had respect to God. Let it also be considered, that the sacrifices offered to God are said sometimes to have been accepted, and at other times, not accepted by him.† But there could have been no propriety in these statements, unless the sacrifices offered to him had been intended, either as gifts or as expiations, either to obtain or to secure his favour. For it must be obvious, that those sacrifices were said to be accepted, which were both offered to God and pleasing to him; and that those were said not to be accepted, which, though they were offered to God, yet were not pleasing to him, nor available with him for the purpose which the offerer wished them to accomplish.

VII. Our argument is further corroborated by most of the sacrificial rites: such as placing the victim before the altar, and there, with imposition of hands upon its head, consecrating and devoting it to

* Mal. i. 8. † Levit. i. 4. xxii. 21. 23. 25. Mal. i. 10. 13.

God. For it is certain that this solemn devotion of of the victim had respect to God, to whom the victim was devoted. To these add the sacrificial rites that were to be performed by the priests: such as bringing the divided parts of the victim to the altar, and pouring out the blood there, or, in some cases, sprinkling it towards the vail or towards the mercy-seat. All these were rites by which the sacrifices were presented to God. For the altar was God's table, the mercy-seat was like an altar, and the inner sanctuary was the most sacred apartment of the divine habitation: so that whatever was solemnly carried to the altar, or towards the mercy seat or inner sanctuary, was considered as at the same time presented to God. The same remark may be applied to those sacrifices which were waved by the hands of the priests towards all the parts of the world: a ceremony by which they were presented to God as the omniscient and omnipresent sovereign of the universe, As, therefore, some part at least of the sacrifices was presented to God by a sacred rite, and as the rite by which this presentation was made, had respect to God, and constituted the distinguishing charateristic of every sacrifice; it follows as a necessary consequence, that every sacrifice properly had respect to God.

VIII. Nor can I believe any person to be so senseless as to suppose, that in serving at the altar, and carrying to it the blood and parts of the victims, the labours of the priests were directed merely to the altar and not to God. For in all worship rendered to God, those rites which combine the form of external with the design of internal worship, have the same object as the internal worship itself. Otherwise we must maintain that prayers uttered

with the lips, which must necessarily cause a motion of the air, have respect, not to God, but to the air; and that whenever a sacrifice was brought to the altar, it was offered to the altar, and not to God; than which, nothing can be imagined more absurd. All rites, therefore, may be contemplated in different points of view: considered physically, they exhibit nothing more than certain gestures of the body and operations of the hands: but it is quite another thing, to consider them as belonging to divine worship. Thus though the ceremony of laying the parts of the victim on the altar, considered as an action of the hands, had reference merely to the altar; yet, as an act of external and a sign of internal worship, it had respect properly to God. The same remark may be applied to the bending of the knees, and the bowing of the head or of the whole body; of which, when performed as acts of solemn worship, the immediate reference to God is too obvious to admit a single doubt.

IX. For the further illustration of the topic under present consideration, we must recall to our attention what has been already stated, that all the Jewish sacrifices were offered to God, either as the maker and sovereign of the universe, or as the giver of all good, or as possessing absolute power to punish and to pardon; so that, it is easy to perceive, those sacrifices included the most solemn acts of religion, and the proper nature and design of divine worship. This notion of sacrifices is fully conveyed both by the scriptures, in which those who should sacrifice to strange gods, are condemned to be put to death, as idolaters, and rebels against the true God;* and by

* Exod. xxii. 20. xxxiv. 14, 15. Deut. xxxii. 16, 17.

the decrees of the Sanhedrim, in which, as Maimonides states,* all are pronounced guilty of strange worship, 'who shall bend the body, pour out a libation, burn incense, or immolate an animal to any 'strange god.' Wherefore, as sacrifices included the proper nature and design of divine worship, they cannot be denied to have had respect to God, unless it be also denied that divine worship has respect to God; which would be denying that God is worshipped even when worship is actually rendered to him.

X. Since all worship of God, whether natural or instituted, is designed either to supplicate or to commemorate his favour, the inference is unavoidable, that sacrifices, which have been proved to include the proper nature and design of divine worship, must have had the same objects. And, as we have already shown, eucharistic sacrifices were offered to commemorate the favour of God: holocausts also were sometimes offered for the same purpose, though they appear to have been often employed as means of supplicating that favour. Similar objects were contemplated in all the other sacrifices. Some, which were voluntary, were offered in order to obtain prosperity; others, which were votive, to avert dangers; and others, denominated sin offerings and trespass offerings were designed to expiate sins and trespasses, that is, to obtain their forgiveness. Thus there were no sacrifices which had not respect to God, in like manner as praises, thanksgivings, and prayers. Nor ought this to be thought strange, since the affections, and desires of the mind might be implied and signified by actions as well as by words, by rites as well as by prayers; and the ceremonies connected with

* In Shegagoth, c. 7.

sacrifices contained acknowledgments of God's supreme power over life and death, and his absolute sovereignty over the universe.

To the same purpose we may cite the words of the prophet, by whom solemn prayers are called "the "calves of the lips:"* the reason of which is, that prayers are a species of sacrifices, and sacrifices a species of prayers. Prayers are spiritual sacrifices, and sacrifices are symbolical prayers. This is evident from the language of Saul, who, because he had not *offered sacrifice*, represents himself as not having *made supplication*:† — and from that of Solomon; "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination unto "the Lord; but the prayer of the upright is his "delight."‡ This sentence implies, that even the sacrifices of the wicked, so far from being available with God, were on the contrary displeasing to him, but that the prayers of every good man were very prevalent with him. Now there would have been no reason for instituting this comparison, if sacrifices and prayers had not unquestionably been directed to the same object. Sacrifices, however, all other circumstances being alike, would have been thought more available than simple prayers. But whoever considers the efficacy of the one as having respect to God, ought to entertain the same opinion of the efficacy of the other.

XI. The principle we have been maintaining is further confirmed by the prayers which used to be offered up at the time of sacrifice. Their design was, that the sacrifices which they accompanied might be acceptable to God, and might obtain from him those favours on account of which they were

* Hos. xiv. 2. † I Sam. xiii. 12. ‡ Prov. xv. 8.

immolated. An example of this occurs in the second book of Maccabees: "And the priests made a prayer "while the sacrifice was consuming, both the priests "and the rest, Jonathan beginning, and the rest an-"swering thereunto, as Neemias did. And the "prayer was after this manner: O Lord, Lord God, "Creator of all things, who art fearful and strong, "righteous and merciful, and the only and gracious "king, the only giver of all things, the only just, "almighty, and everlasting, thou that deliverest "Israel from all trouble, and didst choose the fa-"thers and sanctify them: receive the sacrifice for "thy whole people Israel, and preserve thine own "portion, and sanctify it. Gather those together "that are scattered from us, deliver them that serve "among the heathen, look upon them that are "despised and abhorred, and let the heathen know, "that thou art our God. Punish them that oppress "us, and with pride do us wrong. Plant thy people "again in thy holy place, as Moses hath spoken."* To the same purpose may be cited the prayers offered by every offender over an expiatory victim, concluding with the words, 'Let this be my expiation:'—and the petitions of David, which had reference to sacrifices though not uttered at the time of their oblation; "Remember all thy (meat) offerings, and "accept (or, turn to ashes) thy burnt sacrifice."† Now those prayers, whose object was, that the sacrifice which was presented might be acceptable to God, and might obtain from him those things on account of which it was offered, clearly show, that the proper efficacy of every sacrifice had respect to God. For in vain would prayers have been employed

* II Maccab. i. 23—29. † Psal. xx. 3.

to promote God's acceptance of that which was not designed either to commemorate, or to supplicate, or to secure his favour.

XII. Let us next advert to those things which are designated as sacrifices in a metaphorical sense. In the first place, prayers and thanksgivings are called sacrifices;* and that for no other reason, than because they have this character in common with sacrifices strictly so called, that they properly have respect to God. The same appellation is given to donations, labours, and pains, performed and endured so as to be acceptable to God. Thus it is applied, to benefits conferred upon the needy; to a broken and contrite spirit, that is, to repentance for sins; to a body adorned with purity; to blood shed in the cause of God; and to the conversion of the heathens:† and most of these things, at the same time that they are named sacrifices, are likewise affirmed to be acceptable to God. Hence it is obvious, that they are designated as sacrifices, because they are acceptable to God and means of seeking his favour; and consequently, sacrifices properly so called must have had the same object. Otherwise the sacred writers would have been chargeable with great inaccuracy in this metaphorical use of the term. For no expression could be transferred from real sacrifices to metaphorical ones, which did not in some way belong to those which were properly so called. Wherefore, as it is evident from other considerations, that all sacrifices properly so called partook of the nature of divine worship; so, from the remarks which have now been made, it appears that this worship was

* I Pet. ii. 5. Heb. xiii. 15. † Philip. iv. 18. Heb. xiii. 16. Psalm li. 17. Rom. xii. 1. Philip. ii. 17. Rom. xv. 16.

pleasing to God, and available to obtain his favour, so far as it was connected with sincerity and true piety of heart. And this is what the scriptures intend whenever they speak of sacrifices as "offerings "to God of a sweet savour unto the Lord:" and hence St. Paul, when he means to describe the voluntary death of Christ as highly acceptable to God, employs the same expression.* Nor should it be forgotten, that this language is used, not only of burnt offerings† and peace offerings,‡ but likewise of expiatory victims offered for sins of ignorance committed by any of the common people:§ though it is never used in reference to those victims which were offered for the errors of the high priest, or of a ruler, or of the whole congregation, or consequently, of the Sanhedrim. The reason of this difference Abarbinel‖ supposed to be, that a sin of ignorance was a less offence in one of the common people, and that the expiation of his guilt by a victim taken out of his own flock was an evidence of sincerity which was very pleasing to God; but that on the contrary, in the Sanhedrim, or the high priest, or a ruler, ignorance and transgression of the law was highly disgraceful, and the oblation of an expiatory sacrifice was entitled to no praise. Though the sacrifices of wicked men never conciliated any favour with God, but were always displeasing to him, yet even those sacrifices, as being offered to God, must also have had respect to him. For the prayers of the wicked are always displeasing to God; yet, nevertheless, being addressed to him, they properly have respect to him: and the same must he affirmed of all sacri-

* Ephes. v. 2. † Exod. xxix. 18. Levit. i. 9. 13. ‡ Levit. iii. 5. 16.
§ Levit. iv. 31. ‖ Ad Levit. iv.

fices presented to God, by whomsoever they were offered.

XIII. Though what has already been said sufficiently establishes this position respecting all the Jewish sacrifices, we shall add some remarks by which it may be further corroborated in reference to the piacular victims, which typified the sacrifice of Christ in a more eminent degree than all the rest. This will appear from the relation subsiting between God, and the person by whom those victims were offered; one party sustaining the character of a sinner, and the other that of an offended sovereign, having power to punish or to pardon. For expiatory sacrifices, as we have already stated, were never offered, but in order to avert punishment; nor was there any reason why any one should use means to avert punishment, unless he had committed some sin. Hence it is evident, that in all piacular sacrifices, the offerer in the character of a sinner, and the priest also on his behalf, in order to obtain the forgiveness of the offence, approached as supplicants, to God as the party offended, and having power to punish or pardon:—the sinner presenting his victim at the altar, and performing the other rites, which belonged to him, to express his sorrow for the offence he had committed, and his desires that God would be merciful to him; the priest sprinkling the blood about the altar and upon its horns, that is, by a symbolical rite presenting to God the life of the slaughtered animal. And unless the priest did this with a sincere desire that God might be propitious and favourable to the sinner, he was not such a man as it behoved a priest to be, and as God himself required. "For "every high priest taken from among men, is ordained

"for men in things pertaining to God; that he may "offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: who can have "compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are "out of the way; for that he himself also is com-"passed with infirmity. And by reason hereof he "ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to "offer for sins."* The high priest of the Jews therefore, as well as the other priests, was himself taken from among men, and liable to error, that being conscious of his frailty he might offer expiatory sacrifices, as for himself, so for his brethren, and might cherish the same desires, that God would be merciful to others as to himself.

XIV. The expiatory victims sacrificed for the whole congregation used to be brought to the altar, and consecrated to God, not by the whole people, but either by the high priest, or by the elders, and that by the express command of the law.† But whatever was done by the high priest or elders on these occasions was done by them as representatives of the people; so that the people were considered as offering every victim, which either the high priest or the elders offered in their stead, and on their behalf.

But this point is too obvious to require further illustration. We shall conclude this chapter with a brief summary of the arguments advanced in it.—In the *first* place, we have shown, that God appointed the Jewish sacrifices to be offered to himself with certain solemnities. *Secondly*, those rites were designed and contrived to signify God's power over life and death, his authority to punish and pardon, and his supreme dominion over the universe. It was for this purpose, that God required the victim to be brought to his altar, and there to be offered

* Heb. v. 1.—3. † Levit. xvi. 7—9. iv. 15.

and consecrated to him; that he commanded the blood, entrails, or, in the case of burnt offerings, the whole victim, to be laid upon his altar; that is, to be presented to him as the proprietor and governor of all things: and that he directed some sacrifices to be waved towards the various parts of the world; by which they were symbolically presented to him as the universal proprietor and sovereign. *Thirdly*, we remark, that those rites by which any thing was thus offered or presented to God, partook of the true nature of divine worship, though only of an external kind; and had respect to God, as much as bowing the knees, bending the head or body, or any other similar ceremonies which are employed in sacred services as acts of divine worship. *Lastly*, we wish it to be observed, that the sacrificial rites, whether performed by the offerer himself, or by the priest, were required to be performed in such a manner, that the external and symbolical worship should be accompanied by the worship of the mind; by that faith in the providence, justice, and goodness of God, that reverence for his holy laws, that repentance for sins, and those purposes of future obedience, which become all sincere and pious men: and whoever offered sacrifices with this state of mind, was accepted by God.

These particulars present a general view of the religious principles and purposes connected with sacrifices; and prove that they were presented to God, like prayers and thanksgiving; with this difference, that other external signs were employed to express the internal worship of the mind. But these remarks are to be understood as referring to sacrifices in general; for those things which belong exclusively to the piacular victims require a separate examination.

CHAPTER XX.

Proofs that the Jews considered their Sacrifices as having respect to God, and that the Heathens believed their Sacrifices to have respect to their Deities. The Opinion of the Christian Fathers concerning these Rites.

HAVING stated my own sentiments concerning all kinds of sacrifices, I conceive it will not be irrelevant to the subject, to advert to the concordant opinions which have been held by the Jews and Heathens on their respective sacrifices, and by the ancient Christian writers on both.

To begin with the Jews: Philo describes those who approached the altars as always approaching them 'for the purpose of supplicating or giving thanks:'* which shews that they considered their sacrifices as having respect to God equally with prayers and thanksgivings. The same conclusion is established by another passage of the same author:† 'If any one 'is desirous of carefully examining the reasons which 'induced the first men to express their thanksgivings 'and prayers by means of sacrifices, he will find that 'they were chiefly two. One was the honour of God; 'a thing good and necessary in itself, independently of 'every thing else: the other was the advantage of the 'offerers; which was twofold, consisting in an enjoy-'ment of good things, and an exemption from evils. 'To that class which are to be offered to God for 'himself only, the law has assigned the holocaust, 'from which nothing is taken by human cupidity, but 'which is presented entire and perfect to the all 'perfect Deity. Those which are intended for the

* De Animal. ad Sacrif. † Ibid.

'benefit of men, because opinion has divided them, 'are also divided by the law into two kinds; one for 'the acquisition of good, named a peace offering; the 'other for an exemption from evil, called an offering 'for sin.' This language implies that they presented their sacrifices to God, as symbolical praises, thanksgivings, and supplications.

II. Similar sentiments are expressed by Abarbinel:* The design of the peace offerings 'will be evident, as 'soon as you know that they were either eucharistic, 'or votive and voluntary. These two kinds may be 'thus described. Our ancestors sometimes sacrificed 'peace offerings in order to signify their thankful 'acknowledgments to God for his supreme clemency 'and benevolence towards them, and for all his 'benefits, whether displayed in their inheritance and 'possession of the land, or in other wonderful achievements; and these which the law calls "sacrifices of 'thanksgiving," belonged to the first kind. The 'other kind, which included the votive and voluntary, 'was intended as a species of supplications, in which 'they besought God, that he would be merciful to 'them for the time to come, that he would bless their 'crops and prosper all their affairs, and that he would 'supply them with all the necessaries of life. Hence 'it appears, that oblations of the one kind were a 'sort of thanksgivings for favours previously received; 'and those of the other, supplications for benefits 'desired.' To the same purpose he says in another place:† 'After the eucharistic sacrifice the scripture 'speaks of votive and voluntary sacrifices, which were 'always offered to God, as vows and prayers, in 'order to obtain prosperity.' These things relate to

* In Præf. ad Levit. † Ad Levit. iii.

the peace offerings: but let us hear what account this rabbi gives of the design of the piacular sacrifices:* 'The law has not commanded the blood of any 'piacular victim to be sprinkled within the sanctuary, 'except that atonement might be made and pardon 'obtained with God for some offence of more than 'common enormity, such as every crime was believed 'to be that was committed by the high priest or the 'Sanhedrim.' This language implies that all piacular victims were sacrificed in order to obtain pardon of sins and favour with God; but that those whose blood was to be carried into the sanctuary, were offered for greater offences than others: for that the same criminal act involved greater criminality when committed by the high priest or Sanhedrim than when committed by any common individual. On the sin offering for the high priest the same author remarks:† 'He shall sprinkle some of the blood of the victim 'towards the vail of the inner sanctuary and on the 'altar of incense, in order that he may obtain 'remission and expiation from before God in the 'sanctuary.' Of the daily burnt offerings the same writer says:‡ 'The daily burnt offerings were intended 'as a species of solemn supplications presented to 'God, that he would be pleased to remember his 'mercy towards Israel morning and evening, that he 'would increase their corn, and wine, and oil: as is 'evident from the meat offering and drink offering, 'which were to accompany them.' So Rabbi Moses Ben Nachman§ describes the burnt offerings of individuals as 'supplicating' for the offerers. And Isaac Ben Arama‖ considers all sacrifices as so nearly allied to prayers, that he concludes the latter to be avail-

* In Præf. ad Levit. † Ibid. ‡ Ad Levit. xvi. § Ad Levit. i. ‖ Ad Levit. vi.

able now for the same purposes which in ancient times were obtained by the former: 'Prayers are 'like sacrifices, and indeed are superior to them. 'Nor is it necessary to say that they supply the place 'of sacrifices since sacrifices have ceased to be 'offered.' The same author represents sacrifices as having been offered for supplication, deprecation, and propitiation.*—After the Jews were deprived of the opportunity of sacrificing, the Sanhedrim decreed; that instead of the stated sacrifices they should offer stated prayers; evidently considering the design of sacrifices and prayers as one and the same. 'They 'decreed,' says Maimonides,† 'that the number of 'prayers should be equal to the number of sacrifices; 'namely, two daily prayers, corresponding to the 'two daily sacrifices: and as there was an additional 'sacrifice every day, they decreed that there should 'be a third prayer, corresponding to that additional 'sacrifice. The prayer which answers to the morning 'sacrifice, is called the morning prayer; that which 'answers to the evening sacrifice, the evening prayer; 'and that which answers to the additional sacrifice, 'the additional prayer. In like manner they ap-'pointed, that one prayer should be said in the night, 'because the members of the evening holocaust used 'to remain burning all night.' The opinion of the Jews, on the great resemblance between prayers and sacrifices, will further appear from other passages of this writer. 'The congregation uses no prayer that 'is not commanded, because the congregation offered 'no sacrifice that was not commanded;' that is, no voluntary sacrifice. 'There are some of the doctors, 'who think it unlawful for any person, on the sabbath

* Ad Levit. i. † In Tephilla Ubircath Cohan. c. 1.

'or festival days, to use any prayer that is not com-
'manded; because on those days, only the sacrifices
'that were commanded used to be offered, but no
'voluntary ones.' The obvious inference from all these statements is, that the Jews had the same opinion of sacrifices as of prayers, and that, in consequence of this opinion, after the discontinuance of sacrifice, they supplied the place of the stated sacrifices by certain forms of prayer corresponding to those sacrifices.

III. And it may be proper to mention, in passing, that as the immolation of animal victims, so likewise all oblations of things inanimate, were designed as acts of divine worship. For they were presented to God as the giver of all the good things, wine, oil, and corn, produced by the earth or the trees for the support of human life: and every meat offering denoted the supplication of the offerer for plentiful crops, or his thanksgivings for having enjoyed them. This is the representation of Abarbinel in a passage lately quoted. The same explanation is given by Rabbi Levi Ben Gerson:* 'As they offered to God,
'to whom be praise, a sheaf at the passover, in order
'to obtain a prosperous harvest; and two loaves at
'pentecost, in order to obtain an abundance of
'fruits:† so at the feast of tabernacles, when the
'seed time was at hand, they also presented to God
'drink offerings of water, in order to obtain plentiful
'showers.' But these libations were not commanded in the law. It is sufficiently evident, however, that sacrifices were considered by the Jews as having respect to God equally as much as prayers and thanksgivings.

* Ad II Sam. xxiii. 15. † Levit. xxiii. 10. 17.

IV. The opinion of the Heathens respecting their sacrifices was just the same as that of the Jews respecting theirs. This appears from the language of Porphyry:* 'Sacrifices are to be offered to the gods 'for three reasons; as tributes of honour, expressions 'of gratitude, or supplications of good.' The two former of these reasons the Jews properly reduce to one; because in the honours which persons rendered to God by offering sacrifices, their praises of his infinite wisdom and power were always united with commemorations of his goodness, either as conspicuous in the universe at large, or as displayed in some particular favour towards themselves, or their families, or their country: and these praises and honours have the same object, and belong to the same species of worship, as thanksgivings. Though what precise objects the Heathens contemplated in sacrificing to their gods, is of little importance to our argument; which only maintains that they considered every kind of sacrifices as having the nature and efficacy of divine worship. Let us cite another passage from Porphyry:† 'We worship the gods, either 'that we may solicit them to avert evils from us and 'to supply us with good things, or because we have 'received benefits already, or that we may obtain 'some advantage, or that we may render the honour 'due to the mere goodness of their nature: so that 'if any animals are immolated, they must be sacri-'ficed to the gods for one of these purposes; for 'we have one of these objects in view as the end of 'every sacrifice.' Hence we may learn that the Heathens offered sacrifices to their deities, either to supplicate or commemorate their favour, or to honour

* De Abstinen. L. ii. s. 24. † Ibid.

them on account of the mere excellence of their nature; and that they regarded their sacrifices as a superior species of worship and highly acceptable to their gods.

V. This is further evinced by their sacrificial prayers. 'Sacrificial prayers' are mentioned by Sophocles,* and explained by the scholiast to be 'prayers said at the time of sacrificing.' The design of those prayers we are at no loss to know from the forms transmitted to us by Cato.† 'Father Janus, 'on raising this pile I address to thee good prayers, 'that, being honoured with this cake, thou wilt deign 'to be propitious to me and my children, to my 'house and family.' Again: 'Father Janus, as on 'raising this pile I have well addressed thee in good 'prayers, for the sake of this very thing vouchsafe to 'accept inferior wine.' Another form is: 'O Jupiter, 'while presenting this cake, I address to thee good 'prayers, that, being honoured with this cake, thou 'wilt deign to be propitious to myself and my 'children, to my house and family.' Passing over many other forms, we shall add the following, used at a triple sacrifice, consisting of animals of three different species: 'Father Mars, I pray to thee, and 'beseech that thou wilt deign to be propitious to me, 'to my house, and to my family, for the sake of 'which I have ordered triple sacrifices to be carried 'about my field, land, and farm, that thou wilt keep 'off, forefend, and avert diseases seen and unseen, 'loss and desolation, calamities and judgments; that 'thou wilt permit the corn and fruits, vineyards and 'coppices, to grow and prosper; that thou wilt pre-'serve the shepherds and flocks in safety; and wilt

* In Antigone. † De Re Rustica, c. 134.

'grant health and happiness to myself, my house, 'and my family. For the sake of these things, to 'purify my farm, land, and field, and to effect the 'purgation, as I have said, deign to accept these 'three sucking animals which are now to be sacri-'ficed.' Hence we learn that the Heathens employed sacrifices as well as prayers in order to obtain prosperity and the favour of their gods, and that they believed their sacrifices to be as efficacious for this purpose as their prayers.

VI. The same ideas are conveyed in the terms used by the heathen writers on all occasions to express the efficacy of sacrifices:—terms which clearly denote *propitiating the gods, appeasing their anger, averting the effects of their displeasure, making a propitiatory atonement.*

Homer describes Minerva as propitiated by sacrifice; and Hesiod recommends sacrifice as the means of propitiating Jupiter and the other gods.—Plautus speaks of daily supplicating a god with incense, wine, or other offerings. Pliny mentions the offering of the salted cake as an ancient mode of supplication; and represents animal sacrifices as having great influence in propitiating the gods. Horace asserts the propriety of placating the gods by the blood of a calf; and introduces Agamemnon as having propitiated them by the blood of his own daughter. This horrible circumstance is referred to by Virgil, in almost the same words. Cæsar affirms it to have been believed by the Gauls, that the majesty of the gods could not be propitiated, unless the life of man were sacrificed for the life of man. Cicero, Livy, and Suetonius, all agree in representing sacrifices as

offered for the purpose of averting the anger of the gods and obtaining their favour.*

* Ενθαδε μιν ταυροισι και αρνειοις ιλασονται.

Homer. Il. ii. 550.

Αλλοτε δη σπονδησι θυεσσιτε ιλασκεσθαι.

Hesiod. Oper. et Dier. i. 336.

Hinc etiam καλλιερειν dictus est, cui exta victimæ deos propitios pollicebantur.

Ea mihi cotidie,
Aut thure, aut vino, aut aliqui semper supplicat.

Lar apud Plautum, in Prolog. Aulular.

Magna est pecori gratia in placamentis deorum. *Plin. Hist. Nat.* L. viii. c. 48.

Et thure et fidibus juvat
Placare, et vituli sanguine debito
Custodes Numidæ deos.

Horat. Carm. L. i. Od. 36.

Prudens placavi sanguine divos.

Horat. Serm. L. ii. Sat. 3.

Sanguine placasti ventos.

Virgil. Æneid. ii. 116.

Galli, pro vita hominis nisi vita hominis reddatur, non posse deorum immortalium numen placari arbitrantur. *Cæsar de Bell. Gall.* L. vi. Vide etiam *Cicer. pro Fonteio.*

Dicitur Otho per omnia piaculorum genera manes Galbæ propitiare tentasse. *Sueton. in Othone*, c. 7.

Nec minus propitii erant mola salsa supplicantibus, imo vero, ut palam est, placatiores. *Plin. Hist. Nat.* L. xii. c. 18.

Per dies aliquot hostiæ majores sine litatione cæsæ, diuque non impetrata pax deum.—Senatus majoribus hostiis usque ad litationem sacrificari jussit. Cæteris diis perlitatum feruint, Saluti Petilium perlitasse negant. *Livii. Hist.* L. xxvii. c. 25. L. xli. c. 15.

Quid? quum pluribus diis immolatur, qui tandem evenit, ut litetur aliis, aliis non litetur? *Cicero de Divinat.* L. ii.

Dein pluribus hostiis cæsis cum litare non posset, introiit in curiam spreta religione. *Sueton. in Julio*, c. 81.

Si hercle istuc unquam factum est, tum me Jupiter
Faciat, ut semper sacrificem, nec unquam litem.

Plaut. in Pœnulo.

Secundum *Servium, ad Æneid.* 4. et *Macrobium*, L. iii. c. 5. vox *litare* est sacrificio placare numen.—Secundum *Nonium Marcellum*, c. 5. n. 12. *Sacrificare* est veniam petere: *litare* est propitiare et votum impetrare.—Secundum *Vossium, Etymolog. Sacrificare* generale erat: *litare* autem locum habebat, cum sacrificium esset diis gratum.

It is of no importance to our argument, if there were some Heathens who considered it improper to worship their gods with animal sacrifices, or with any sacrifices at all. For those who refused to worship their gods in this way, did not deny that they were so worshipped, or that these services had respect to them; which is as sufficient for our present purpose, as if they had agreed with others, who formed a very large majority, in regarding sacrifice not only as a proper mode of worship, but also as possessing a propitiatory efficacy.

VII. If we inquire what the Christian fathers thought of sacrifices, we shall find it to have been their unanimous opinion that it was never lawful to offer sacrifices except to the one true God; and consequently that they considered sacrifices as including the nature and design of divine worship. On this principle they condemned those who sacrificed to the heathen deities as guilty of idolatry. Thus Tertullian:* 'If I comply with an invitation to attend a sacrifice, 'I shall be a partaker of idolatry.' And again: 'If 'any one deliver wine to a person who is sacrificing, 'nay, if he assist by a word necessary to the sacri-'fice, he will be accounted a promoter of idolatry.' Thus Cyprian,† to guard the Christians against sacrificing to the gods of the Heathens, urges the divine denunciation: "He that sacrificeth unto any "god, save unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly "destroyed."‡ But it is needless to adduce testimonies on so plain a matter. One remark will be sufficient. They who thought that sacrifices could never, without the dreadful crime of idolatry, be offered to any other than the one true God, which

* De Idololat. c. 16. † De Lapsis. ‡ Exod. xxii. 20.

was the opinion of all the Christian fathers; must have attributed to sacrifices the proper nature and design of divine worship, and consequently must have concluded that all sacrifices, legitimately offered as acts of sacred worship, had respect to God.

VIII. Since it is evident that all sacrifices legitimately offered were intended to have respect to God, it follows that the same may be affirmed of the Sacrifice of Christ. For whatever was the object of every legitimate sacrifice, must necessarily have been the object of the sacrifice of Christ. And as his sacrifice belongs to the piacular class, and the whole class of piacular sacrifices was designed to obtain the pardon of transgressions; it follows that his sacrifice was designed to procure from God the pardon of our sins, on whose behalf it was offered. It seemed proper to remark this in passing, that we may not appear, in this and the preceding chapter, to have been pursuing an argument of no importance to our main subject.

CHAPTER XXI.

Vicarious Punishment explained, and Proofs that it was inflicted on the Piacular Victims.

HAVING shown that all the kinds of sacrifices appointed by the law of Moses had respect to God, we proceed to a more particular discussion of the Piacular Victims, respecting which we have affirmed, and are about to prove, that they were the subjects of Vicarious Punishment. Vicarious punishment is any evil inflicted upon one being to expiate the guilt of another, with a design to save the sinner himself from punishment, and to procure the pardon of his sin. There is nothing of vicarious punishment in those evils which a man, in consequence of his sins, suffers in any person connected with him: as when parents on this account are bereaved of their children. For the end of vicarious punishment is to procure pardon for the offender; who equally fails of obtaining it, whether he is punished in his connections, or in his own person. And all vicarious punishment is intended for the advantage of the sinner; but a contrary result is produced by that punishment, in which the calamity of another always causes loss, grief, or disgrace, to redound to the sinner himself.

Vicarious punishments are of two kinds. One, when the same kind of punishment as the offender has deserved is inflicted on the substitute; as if any one should give himself up to die, in order to deliver another from death:—the other, when the punishment inflicted on the substitute is different from that which the offender has deserved; as if any one were to go into exile, in order to redeem another from

slavery. The only difference between these two cases is, that in one there is a commutation of persons only, and in the other of persons and punishments: but this difference prevents not their being both equally within the description of vicarious punishment.

II. The vicarious punishment inflicted on the piacular victims accomplished the expiation of sins, as a condition prescribed in the law, without which God would not remit those offences on account of which he commanded the victims to be slain. For though they were chiefly of the lighter kind, yet God would not pass them by without any sort of punishment, lest such entire indulgence should operate as an encouragement to sin. While he commanded the greater transgressions, therefore, to be expiated by the blood of the sinner himself, he required the smaller ones to be atoned for, and their pardon to be sought and obtained from him by the blood of a victim. Hence it is evident that the piacular sacrifices included a condition of pardon, which was not ineffective and useless, but which at once afforded an apt representation of God's justice and holiness and displeasure against sin, and was well calculated to excite and maintain a reverence for his holy laws.

III. But that I may not appear to have hazarded unwarrantable assertions, I hasten to a more particular discussion of the subject propounded at the commencement of the chapter. And here I request the reader's attention to the following remarks. In the *first* place, the sacred writers frequently speak of sins which have not been expiated, as of a taint by which the sinner is dreadfully defiled:* and hence the expiation

* Levit. xviii. 20. Psal. cvi. 39. Jer. ii. 23. Ezek. xx. 7. 18. 31. xxii. 3. Matt. xv. 18. 20.

of sins is often designated by terms which convey the idea of purification.* *Secondly*, it was the custom of the Hebrews, on the solemn day of atonement, in obedience to the command of God, for the sins of all the people to be transferred, in a symbolical representation, to the goat that was to be led away into the wilderness: in consequence of which that animal was so polluted with the defilement of those sins, as to communicate a similar pollution to the person who led him away. This is evident from the command that every one who had performed that office should undergo a purifying ablution before his return to the camp. *Thirdly*, the rite by which the sins of the people were transferred, was the imposition of the high priest's hands upon the head of the goat, accompanied with a solemn confession of those sins: in which it is obvious that the high priest acted as the representative of the people, whose sins he confessed and whose pardon he implored. *Lastly*, the piacular victims whose blood was carried into the sanctuary, and whose bodies were burned without the camp, had performed over them the same rite of imposition of hands with c nfession of sins, and derived from that rite the same pollution as the emissary goat. In proof of this it is sufficient to observe, that the carcasses of these victims were immediately to be carried forth without the camp, and that the persons who burned them were so defiled by performing that office, that they were forbidden to return to the camp without bathing themselves in water. Wherefore, as the same rite, by

* Such are the Greek words καθαριζω and καθαρισμος; *Heb.* i. 3. ix. 22. xxiii. 1. I *John* i. 7. and the Hebrew כפר and טהר which are sometimes rendered in the Septuagint by καθαριζω; *Deut.* xxxii. 43. *Isaiah* vi. 7. xlvii. 11. *Psal.* xvi. 30. xix. 12. li. 2.

which the sins of the people were laid upon the emissary goat, was also performed upon these victims, and as in both cases there was the same subsequent indication of communicated pollution, it is reasonable to conclude, that the sins of the guilty were as much transferred to these victims as to that goat. There was this material difference,—that by being led alive into the wilderness, and carrying away the sins of the people that were laid upon him, as if never more to return into the presence of God, the goat exhibited a representation of atonement effected and pardon obtained; but the other victims to which we refer, expiated the sins transferred to them by their own blood. And there could not be a more evident instance of vicarious punishment, than for the sins of the offerers first to be transferred, by a symbolical rite, to the victims about to be slain, and then to be immediately expiated by the blood of those victims to which they had been transferred. The translation of sins has been evinced in the preceding statement, and the price of expiation is determined by the law, which declares, "it is the blood that maketh an atonement for "the soul."*

IV. The reason why imposition of hands communicated pollution to the victims which were burned without the camp, rather than to any others, perhaps was, that they were the principal of all the piacular sacrifices. For they were never offered, except for the high priest himself, or for the whole family of Aaron, or for the whole congregation; whose sins, as we have before observed, were more aggravated, and deserving of severer reprobation, than those of other individuals.

* Levit. xvii. 11.

It is of little importance, however, in what manner, the victims of which we are now treating were defiled; whether by imposition of hands, as in the case of the emissary goat, or by the tacit appointment of God, irrespective of that rite. The fact of their pollution is certain. No reason can be imagined why God should appoint, that those which were evidently the principal of all the piacular victims should become impure during the sacrificial process, unless he designed, in this impurity communicated to the bodies of the victims, to exhibit a symbolical representation of the transfer of sins also from the offerers to those victims. And this was the more evident, because the offenders themselves were purged by the same act by which their piacular victims were polluted. Nor can it be doubted that those victims, which by their blood expiated the sins that had been laid upon them, were the subjects of vicarious punishment.

V. But, it will be said, the only tendency of these remarks is, to show that vicarious punishment was inflicted on those victims which were burned without the camp. This is admitted: but the principle of all piacular sacrifices being the same, we are obliged to form the same conclusion respecting them all; especially respecting the sacrifice of Christ, which was typified by these victims in a more eminent degree than by the rest. For to his sacrifice is to be attributed every thing that was prefigured in any of its types, especially in the more remarkable ones; and nothing is to be abstracted from it, that may have been wanting in those which were more obscure. The antitype must include all the characters of all the types, as far as they are to be considered as types. And a stronger indication of vicarious punishment in

Christ was furnished by the divine appointment that there should be a more striking representation of that kind of punishment in the more eminent types of him, than in any others: for which no reason can be conceived, except that they were designed to typify him in this very circumstance.

VI. But though in these victims, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary, and whose carcasses were burned without the camp, the exhibition of vicarious punishment was rather more evident than in the rest; yet the thing itself was the same with all the other piacular victims, whether sin offerings or trespass offerings, as with these. It is a sufficient proof of this, that while the greater offences were to be punished by the death of the sinner himself, the smaller ones were to be expiated by the blood of an animal. Suppose, for example, any one to have arrived at such degree of presumption as to compound the sacred perfume, or knowingly and wilfully to eat fat or blood, he was to be punished with death; whereas the same sins committed in ignorance were expiated by the blood of a victim. And as it was plainly directed by the divine law that the greater sins should be punished by the death of the sinner himself, and the smaller offences expiated by the blood of a victim, what can be more evident than that the punishment, which in the greater offences was inflicted on the offender himself, was transferred in the smaller ones to his victim, and that the punishment of an animal was substituted for that of a man?

What does Crellius say to these things? In so striking an example of substitution does he not acknowledge any commutation? Yes, he represents a sacrifice as having been accepted by divine mercy

instead of the life of a man:* but he elsewhere says: 'Sacrificial expiation is attributed, not to the slaughter 'of the animal, which would truly have been pu-'nishment, but to those things which succeeded 'the slaughter, and principally to the sprinkling of 'the blood, which was performed by the priest in the 'holy of holies, or upon or about the altar.'† But Crellius has greatly deceived himself by too close a comparison of sacred things with civil. For these ceremonies were so contrived, that to inflict the penalty on the animal was one thing, and to discharge it before God by a scrificial rite was another. The former was done when the animal was deprived of life; the latter when the life of the animal was solemnly presented to God; which in this ritual service was not done till the blood, the vehicle of the life, was brought to his altar, or sprinkled towards his sanctuary or mercy seat.

And this kind of punishment, which was designed to propitiate the Divine Being, was so much the more conspicuous in the sacrifices, because the blood of the animal was not only to be shed, but was also to be presented to God by a particular rite. Thus, in piacular sacrifices it was signified that the life of the victim was surrendered to God as the price of expiation, and in order to obtain for the sinner the favour of him to whom it was solemnly presented and on whose altar it was laid. Whatever, then, may be the opinion of those who think nothing impossible to be eluded by their subtleties, we nevertheless give to every such slaughter, which procures remission of sins and the favour of God, the name of vicarious punishment. Nor are we so subtle as to think it of

* Ad Heb. ix. 14. † Contra. Grot. c. 10. p. 87.

much importance whether this purpose was effected by the slaughter itself, or by its representation on the altar in the sprinkling of the blood; or whether the representation of it was made in any other rite, manner, or place. And hence we hesitate not to acknowledge, that vicarious punishment was sustained by Christ, who gave his life as a ransom to expiate our sins and to procure their pardon.*

VII. Nor is our opinion at all shaken by the objection of Socinus, that a beast could not be punished instead of a man, because they are not of one common species. For the sins of men might certainly be transferred to irrational animals by a symbolical representation. This the scripture expressly declares to have been done to the goat that was led into the wilderness on the day of atonement. The sins of men might likewise be expiated by the blood of animal victims. This also is expressly affirmed in the scriptures, as we have already observed. These two things having taken place in the principal piacular sacrifices, what more evident instance of vicarious punishment could be found than they exhibited? Nor is there any reason to doubt that all the other piacular sacrifices proceeded on the same principle. This also, which is necessary to our forming clear apprehensions of the nature and efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, we have proved by other arguments.

But, it will be objected, that the translation of sins from the offenders to any victims could only be figurative or symbolical, but could never be real and actual. This is true. But the symbolical representation of that transfer had some meaning, which we

* Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45.

apprehend could only be, that those victims, in whom this representation was made, were substituted in the place of the offenders, and expiated by a vicarious punishment those trespasses and sins for which they were sacrificed. Although we grant, however, that even in the principal piacular sacrifices there was rather a representation of vicarious punishment, than the thing itself, yet the thing itself must necessarily have taken place in the Sacrifice of our Lord which those sacrifices prefigured. For every type was so adjusted to its antitype, as we have before shown, that whatever was even symbolically represented in the one, is really found in the other.

VIII. Nor does it at all invalidate our argument, that in cases of extreme poverty in the offenders expiation might be made and pardon obtained by a kind of meat offering, in which, so far from the reality of vicarious punishment, there could not be even the appearance of it. For if a meat offering could not be the subject of vicarious punishment, it ought not thence to be immediately concluded that no such punishment was sustained by the piacular victims. As well might it be argued, that the death of Christ was not typified by the death of any piacular victims, because it was not typified by any oblation of flour that was accepted as a sin offering: an argument the futility of which must be obvious to every reader.

IX. But it is further objected, that the piacular victims ought not be considered as having sustained vicarious punishment, unless they suffered a vicarious death; but that their death could not be vicarious, because death was no where denounced in the law, even against the offerers themselves, on account of

those kinds of sins which were to be expiated by sacrifices. As if, indeed, there could be no vicarious punishment, except it was of the same kind as that which would have fallen upon the sinner himself; or, as if the piacular victims could not stand in the place of the offerers, unless the law had in express terms denounced against the offerers themselves the punishment of death for those kinds of sins which were to be expiated by the death of victims. But neither of these suppositions is true, and one of them is contradictory to itself. In the first place, it makes no difference in vicarious punishment, whether the substitute suffers the same kind of punishment which awaited the sinner himself, or some other instead of of it. Either, at the pleasure of him to whom the right of punishing belongs, may avail to avert punishment from the offender. Hence it appears that to sustain *vicarious punishment*, and to suffer *vicarious death*, are not precisely the same, and that one may be inflicted without the other. In the next place, it is not true, that the piacular victims could not stand in the place of the offerers, unless the law in express terms denounced against the offerers themselves the punishment of death for those kinds of sins which were to be expiated by those victims. Such a denunciation would have left no room at all for expiatory sacrifices. For every punishment expressly denounced by the law against offenders, the law would have required to be inflicted upon them; no sacrifice or expiation could have averted it. It is evident from this consideration, that the punishment, whatever it was, which was averted by sacrifices, could not be denounced in the law, against the offerers or offenders themselves, without contradicting the commands for

the oblation of victims; and that it was omitted to be denounced for this very reason, because the law made provision for its being averted by sacrifice.

X. In vain, therefore, shall we seek in express threatnings directed against the offenders themselves, for that punishment which was averted from them by piacular sacrifices. But to discover what it was, we must inquire what punishment might have been inflicted upon them, if it had been the will of God to exercise his authority in that way. And that this punishment was no other than death, is evident from the language of God by Moses: "And whatsoever "man there be of the house of Israel, or of the "strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any "manner of blood; I will even set my face against "that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off "from among his people. For the life of the flesh is "in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the "altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is "the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Here, the blood which is said to make an atonement for the soul denotes the blood of the victims; and *to make an atonement for the soul* is the same as *to be a ransom for the soul.** And to be a ransom for the soul is to avert death. This is evident from the following command: "They shall give every man a "ransom† for his soul unto the Lord, that there be "no plague among them." The word *plague* signifies a pestilence attended with sudden death. We remark further, that to make an atonment for the soul is the same as to make an atonement for the life: for the word *soul* beyond all doubt here signifies the life.

* Exod. xxx. 12. 15, 16.

† פדון נפש-rendered by the Septuagint λυτρα της ψυχης αυτου.

And what is it to make an atonement for the life, but to preserve the life by averting death? Who does not perceive, that the expression itself clearly conveys this meaning, and rejects every other interpretation? This is the sense invariably attributed to it by Jewish writers, whose language I shall introduce in another place. Nor is it any more to be doubted, why a piacular victim is said to have averted death from a man. It is certainly so described, because it did that which properly belonged to it, that is, because it averted from the offerer the punishment of the sin on account of which it was sacrificed. Hence it follows, that that punishment was death: and consequently piacular victims might be said to suffer vicarious death as well as vicarious punishment.

XI. The design of those piacular victims which were offered for the purification of women after childbirth, or in other cases, if there were any, in which there was no sin committed, nor any impurity incurred which could have been avoided, we have already endeavoured to explain. It is only necessary to remark here, that no conclusion can be drawn from those sacrifices, to invalidate the arguments which have just been advanced. For our present inquiry is, not for what reason corporeal impurity, abstracted perhaps from all guilt, was commanded to be purged by sacrifice, but what was the punishment that was averted by those victims which the law directed to be offered for sins properly so called: sins which Crellius himself confesses to have deserved some punishment, which was remitted by God on the oblation of the prescribed sacrifices. This punishment, I say, is the subject of our present investiga-

tion, and what it was, has now, I trust, been sufficiently explained.

XII. Our attention is next called to the points of agreement and difference between vicarious punishment, and the punishment of the sinner in his own person. Whoever well understands these, will be at no loss for an answer to all the other objections which may be alleged by the Socinians against what has now been advanced. And to dispatch this subject in a few words, I observe first, that vicarious punishment, and that which is inflicted upon the sinner himself, both arise, though not both in the same way, out of some violated law; so that where there is no violation of any law, there can be no room for either. But both these kinds of punishment tend to maintain reverence for the laws, and both are calculated to show what regard the legislator has for his own laws, and how strictly he would have them observed by others. Of these things no one entertains any doubt in the punishment inflicted on the sinner himself; and no doubt ought to be entertained in vicarious punishment, if it be that without which the supreme judge will not let the offender go unpunished, nor pardon the sin he has committed, lest the facility of obtaining forgiveness should operate as an encouragement to sin.

XIII. But though there are these, and perhaps other, points of agreement between the two kinds of punishment, yet there are many and important points in which they evidently differ. In the first place, it is the punishment of the sinner himself, and not the vicarious punishment of another, which naturally belongs to the sanction of the law, and is included in its obligation. The law binds over to punishment and

pronounces worthy of it, those who have deserved it.* But no one deserves punishment for the crime of another, unless he is a partaker of that crime. The demerit of sin does not naturally extend beyond the sinner himself. Desert belongs to the will; but nothing is more strictly a man's own, than his will. And the punishment denounced upon the guilty is inflicted by virtue of a right arising out of sin committed; for every sin, as we have just remarked, deserves to be punished. But the right by which vicarious punishment is inflicted, rests, either on the sovereignty of the party who punishes, or on the consent of the party who is punished, united with that sovereignty. The latter of these cases is exhibited in Christ, who voluntarily suffered a death appointed for him by God: the former was exemplified in the Jewish piacular victims, which God, exercising his right of sovereignty, commanded to be sacrificed; though the sins of the offerers were the causes of his exercise of that right in this instance.

XIV. The arguments commonly alleged to show that all evils inflicted in virtue of either of these rights, always want the nature of punishment to the party on whom they are inflicted, fail of proving that they want the nature of vicarious punishment; and only prove that they are of a different nature from that punishment which any person suffers for his own sins: which cannot be denied. But to proceed to what remains; the punishment of the offender himself, if it is equal to the crime, cancels the guilt without the interposition of any person's favour, and with its own efficacy annuls the legal obligation to punishment, by suffering that which the obligation required. But

* Deut. xxv. 2. I Sam. xxvi. 16. Luke xii. 48. Rom. i. 32. Rev. xvi. 6.

vicarious punishment, which exhibits something different from what the obligation requires, has respect, primarily and properly, not to the punitive obligation of the law, but to the will of him who has the right of punishment and of pardon. Hence it is, that the punishment inflicted upon the offender himself, which, whenever it is equal to the crime, cancels the guilt without the addition of any person's favour,—this punishment cannot possibly consist with remission of sin. Whereas the contrary is the case in vicarious punishment, which avails nothing without the interposition of his favour, who has the power to punish and pardon; and which is not considered by him in the same light as the punishment of the sinner himself, but only as a condition adapted to maintain a reverence for his law in general, and especially to restore the authority of that precept which had been violated, and in some measure weakened, by the crime. Such a condition, as it leaves the sinner's exemption from punishment manifestly dependent on the favour of him who has the right of punishing, is perfectly consistent with remission of sin; unless it be supposed that there is no proper remission, where any condition is required in order to its attainment. But this is so far from the truth, that no remission of sin is promised in the scriptures, except on condition of faith, repentance, and a holy life: a condition which, however, contains nothing inconsistent with that clemency which is displayed in remission of sin. Wherefore, as vicarious punishment prevents not the pardon of the sinner from being entirely dependent on the favour of him who has the right of punishing; it follows, that he may prescribe certain conditions, such as repentance and holiness, without

which the sinner can derive no benefit from the punishment of another. For every person is at liberty to dispense his favour in a manner agreeable to himself. Nor can any one set up a just claim to advantage from the favour of another, without a compliance with the conditions annexed to that favour by him who offers it.

Thus we see how the law may be said to be satisfied, by every offender who suffers the punishment of his own sin, and also by a substitute who sustains the punishment of another's sin. The sinner himself does this by bearing the exact penalty of the law: the sinner's substitute by suffering, not the precise penalty of the law, which is no other than the punishment of the sinner himself, but a punishment which secures the same end as the punishment of the sinner himself; and this end as we have just before stated, is the restoration and preservation of the authority of the violated law.

XV. In the last place, to conclude this argument, it is of no importance with what disposition, whether of readiness or reluctance, any person bears the punishments of his own sins, provided they are equal to the crimes; since in that case they are sufficient of themselves to liberate the sinner, and need no aid from any other quarter to accomplish this purpose with upright judges. But the great efficacy by which vicarious punishment obtains pardon from God, to say nothing here of human judges, may be derived from extrinsic considerations: as,—if the person to whom the part of a substitute is assigned, voluntarily submits to the vicarious punishment proposed to him;—if that punishment is heavy, and brings great honour to God;—if it is not only an atonement, but

also a martyrdom, and bears testimony to the divine commands, promises, and threatnings;—if the submission to it exhibits an obedience to God, which furnishes to others a signal example of piety and holiness:—if he who takes the vicarious punishment upon himself, is distinguished by immaculate innocence and pre-eminent dignity of person, and is likewise earnestly desirous of the salvation of those for whom he stands forward to be punished. All these things being united in Christ and in his death, gave his death the powerful efficacy by which it procured for us pardon of sins and favour with God. For whatever promoted and increased God's favourable acceptance of Christ himself, as those circumstances did which we have just mentioned, must likewise have contributed to that potent efficacy of his death, which made it available with God for the object which Christ intended it to accomplish: and this was, to obtain the pardon of our sins, and all other things pertaining to eternal life. Whoever fully understands all these things will easily refute the subtleties in which this subject has been industriously involved by the followers of Socinus.

CHAPTER XXII.

That Piacular Victims, by a Vicarious Punishment, expiated those Sins on Account of which they were sacrificed, shown to have been the Opinion of the ancient Christians and Jews, as well as of the Heathens.

HAVING proved that the piacular victims by a vicarious punishment expiated the sins on account of which they were offered, and shown that no sufficient arguments can be alleged for a contrary opinion; we proceed to confirm what we have advanced by the concordant testimonies of the Christian fathers, and most learned Jewish doctors; to which we shall also add the suffrages of the Heathens.

We begin with the Christian fathers. They certainly thought, not only that the sins of the offerers were laid upon the victims, but also that the lives of the victims were given for those of the offerers. The former appears to have been the opinion of Origen, who from the imposition of hands practised upon the victims infers that the sins of men were laid upon Christ. His words are:* 'He laid his hands 'upon the head of the calf, that is, he laid the sins 'of mankind upon his own head: for he is the head 'of the body the church.' Cyril of Alexandria† represents the same rite as indicating that Christ bore our sins, that is the punishment of them. But on this point Theodoret is still more explicit:‡ 'On the 'head of the victim the offerer laid his hands, as it 'were his actions; for hands are significant of ac-'tions; and for these he offered the sacrifice.'

II. But the Christian fathers believed also that the

* Homil. ad Levit. i. † De Adorat. L. xi. ‡ Quæst. 1. ad Levit.

lives of the victims were sacrificed instead of the lives of the offerers. Thus the author last quoted:* 'The priests laid their hands, not upon all victims, 'but upon those which were offered for themselves, 'and especially their sin offerings; but upon others 'the offerers themselves laid their hands. This was 'a symbol of the substitution of the victim in the 'room of the offerer for whom it was slain.' Thus the same writer in another place: 'As thou, says he, 'hast an immortal soul, so an irrational animal has 'the blood for a soul: wherefore he commands the 'animal's soul or life, that is, the blood, to be offered 'instead of thy immortal and rational soul.'

Similar passages are found in Eusebius of Cæsarea:† 'An attentive observer may learn this 'very thing also from the law respecting sacrifices; 'which enjoins every one who offers a sacrifice, to 'lay his hands on the head of the victim, and holding 'it by the head to bring it to the priest, as offering 'the animal instead of his own head. Wherefore its 'language respecting every victim is, Let the offerer 'present it before the Lord, and lay his hands upon 'the head of his offering: and this was observed 'in every sacrifice, no victim being offered in any 'other way: whence it is concluded that the lives of 'the victims were given instead of the lives of the 'offerers.'

And this was the opinion of Eusebius, not only respecting those victims which were prescribed by the law of Moses, but also respecting those which were offered by Abel, Noah, Abraham, and others of the faithful in earlier ages. The following passage, which we have already had occasion to quote, refers to the

* Quæst. lxi. ad Exod. † Demonstr. Evang. L. i. c. 10.

patriarchs who lived before Moses was born:* 'For 'as pious persons, who were familiar with God, and 'had their minds enlightened by the Divine Spirit, 'saw that they needed a great remedy for the expia-'tion of deadly sins, they concluded that a ransom 'for their salvation ought to be presented to God, 'the disposer of life and death. And having nothing 'to consecrate to him, more excellent or valuable 'than their own lives, they offered the brutes in their 'stead, sacrificing other lives in the room of their 'own.' And a little after: 'As long as men had no 'better victim, none that was great, valuable, and 'worthy of God, it behoved them to offer him animal 'sacrifices in ransom for their own life, and as sub-'stitutes for their own nature.' He thought that these victims were required to be sacrificed, till Christ should offer himself a sacrifice for all nations. He calls Christ 'the great and precious ransom of both 'Jews and Greeks, the expiation of the whole world, 'the victim who laid down his life† for all men. Athanasius also designates Christ as 'a lamb 'whose life was given as a ransom:'‡ and as the term *lamb* has an evident allusion to the Jewish victims, so the annexed description shews that this writer considered the lives of those victims as sacrificed instead of the lives of the offerers. The same opinion appears to have been held by the author of the *Answers to the Orthodox*,§ according to whom 'the blood of the victims was carried into the sanc-'tuary instead of the life of the offerers.'

III. There is reason to believe that respecting the piacular victims the Christian fathers were all agreed;

* Demonstr. Evang. L. i. c. 10. † Αντιψυχον

‡ Προσφατον αντιψυχον. De Incarnat. Verbi. § Resp. ad Quæst. 99.

because the opinion which some have maintained has received no opposition from the rest, and it is common to them all, whenever they speak of Christ as a piacular sacrifice, to express themselves in terms which imply that his death was a vicarious punishment.* But we shall pass these; for our present object is, not to explain the Jewish sacrifices by the Sacrifice of Christ, but to illustrate the Sacrifice of Christ by the Jewish sacrifices.

IV. As it is particularly desirable to know the opinion of every nation respecting their own religious rites, let us next examine how the Jewish piacular victims have been represented by the Jews themselves. All that they have advanced relating to this subject may be referred to three heads. The first contains those passages, in which every offerer placing his victim before the altar is said to have laid his sins upon the head of that victim. The second includes those which affirm the victims, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary and whose carcasses were burned without the camp, to have been polluted by the sins of the guilty thus laid upon them. The last comprehends those passages in which the life of the victim is said to have been given for the life of the offender, and one is described as an atonement, ransom, or redemption for the other.

V. To the first class of testimonies belongs the comment of R. Levi Ben Gerson† on these words, "And Aaron and his sons shall put their hands on

* TR.—The language of Chrysostom, on II Corinth. v. 21. is too striking to be overlooked: 'Him who knew no sin, who was righteousness 'itself, he hath made sin; that is, hath suffered to be condemned (ως 'αμαρτωλον) as a sinner, to die as a person accursed.' *Hom.* ii. *ad* II *Corinth. apud Suicer. Thesaur.* tom. i. Col. 204. Vide etiam *Œcumen, in Heb.* ix. *ibid.*

† Ad Exod. xxix. 10.

"the head of the bullock." 'This,' says he, 'was 'the imposition of their both hands, and was designed 'to indicate, that their sins were removed from them-'selves, and transferred to this animal.' The same author remarks on another passage:* 'The impo-'sition of hands was a tacit declaration on the part 'of every offerer, that he removed his sins from him-'self, and transferred them to that animal.' To the same purpose is the language of Isaac Ben Arama:† 'Whenever any one sins through ignorance, or even 'with knowledge, he transfers his sins from himself, 'and lays them upon the head of his victim. And 'this is the design of those confessions,—I have 'sinned, I have been rebellious, I have done per-'versely; as appears from the confessions of the high 'priest pronounced over the bullock sacrificed as his 'sin offering on the day of atonement.' Among other observations respecting the bullock sacrificed as a sin offering for the whole congregation, Abarbinel says:‡ 'After the confession the sins of the children of Israel 'rested upon him.' Whence we may infer it to have been the opinion of this rabbi, that those sins, of which solemn confession was made over a piacular victim, devolved upon the victim immediately on that confession.

VI. If it be doubted whether those who considered the sins of the offerers as transferred to the victims, believed that those sins were expiated by the death of the victims as by a vicarious punishment, this doubt must at once be removed by the concluding words of the deprecation pronounced over a piacular victim; 'Let this be my expiation:' which as we shall presently show is understood by all the Jews as equi-

* Ad Levit. i. † Ad Levit. iv. ‡ Ad Num. xix.

valent to saying; 'Let the evil which I have deserved 'fall upon the head of my victim.'

VII. These testimonies may suffice, to show the opinion of the Jews that the sins of the guilty were transferred to the victims about to be sacrificed. We have thought it unnecessary to adduce a greater number, because the same idea is included in the second class of passages, which state all those victims, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary and whose carcasses were burned without the camp, to have been polluted with the sins that were laid upon them. Maimonides says:* 'The garments of those 'who were employed in burning the red heifer and 'the goats, were polluted by the same cause as the 'garments of the man who led away the goat into 'the wilderness: which goat, by reason of the many 'sins which he bore, was believed to contaminate 'whatever he touched.' On this passage of Maimonides, R. Shem Tob makes the following observations: 'The master says, moreover, that it was 'commanded that every one should beware of the 'leprosy; for that it is contagious, so that all persons 'despise and avoid it, and feel the same abhorrence 'of it as of the goat that was led into the wilderness, 'which by reason of the many sins that he bore was 'believed to contaminate whatever he touched, Ob-'serve what he says; Which by reason of the many 'sins that he bore was believed to contaminate what-'ever he touched: for the same observation applies 'to the goats that were burned; it was by reason of 'the sins which they bore that they also polluted 'whatever they touched.'

VIII. The same is asserted by Rabbi Levi Ben

* Moreh Nevoch. p. iii. c. 47.

Gerson:* 'It must be understood, that he who 'carried forth the bullock and goat to be burned 'without the camp, became impure, and his garments 'were polluted; in the same manner as the person 'and garments of him who led away the goat into 'the wilderness. For it was because those victims 'bore sins, that they were burned without the camp: 'and that goat also, because he bore sins, was led 'forth without the camp.' Abarbinel, probably for the same reason, remarks that the bullock, sacrificed as a sin offering for the high priest, was burned without the camp 'as a detestable thing.'† The emissary goat, as being polluted with the dreadful defilement of the sins which he bore away, Isaac Ben Arama calls 'an accursed and foul thing.'‡ Nor does he appear to have held a different opinion of the victims burned without the camp, which he describes as polluted in the same manner as that goat:§ 'The 'man who led away the goat into the wilderness, and 'he who burned the piacular victim without the 'camp, were both to wash their garments and bathe 'themselves in water, and then to return into the camp; 'for they were both in the same state, each being 'polluted by that which he removed from the camp.'

IX. But the most conclusive of all the Jewish testimonies are those which we have assigned to the third class; in which the life of the victim is affirmed to have been sacrificed instead of the life of the offender, and is therefore described as 'an atonement 'ransom, or redemption.'

Under this head our attention is first called to the solemn deprecation pronounced over the piacular victims: 'I beseech thee, O Lord, I have sinned,

* Ad Levit. xvi. † Ad Levit. iv. ‡ Ad Levit. xvi. § Ibid.

I have trespassed, I have rebelled; I have—; (*specifying the sin committed*) 'but now I repent, and let 'THIS be my expiation.' The concluding words, 'Let *this* be my expiation,' referred to the victim before the offerer, and the meaning was; 'Let the 'evils which might justly fall upon my head, fall 'upon the head of my victim.' This is the interpretation invariably given of such forms by the Jews. Thus Baal Aruch:* 'In every place where any one 'says: Let me be his expiation, it is the same as if 'he had said, Let me be substituted in his place, 'that I may bear his iniquities: which is equivalent 'to saying, I, in order that he may obtain pardon, 'do take sins upon myself.' The same explanation is adopted by R. Solomon Jarchi:† 'Let us be thy 'expiation, that is, Let us be substituted in thy place, 'that what might deservedly fall upon thee, may all 'fall upon us.' Bartenora, and the author of the book entitled Caph Nachath,‡ have expounded the same form in almost the same words. Maimonides has explained it in the same sense, using the word *redemption* for *expiation*. From these testimonies it appears, that whoever pronounced over a piacular victim the prescribed words, 'Let this be my expia-'tion,' imprecated upon his victim the punishments due to his own sins, and substituted that victim, and considered it as substituted, in his place.

X. To these may be added more ample testimonies from the Jewish doctors, and those relating to burnt offerings, (to which also they attribute a piacular efficacy,) as well as to sin offerings and trespass offerings. What is their language respecting a sinner offering a victim? R. Moses Ben Nachman says:§

* In voce בר † Sanhedr. c. 9. ‡ Ibid. § Ad Levit. i.

'It was just that his blood should be shed, and that 'his body should be burned. But the Creator, of his 'mercy, accepted this victim from him, as his sub-'stitute and ransom; that the blood of the animal 'might be shed instead of his blood, that is, that 'the life of the animal might be given for his life.'—Rabbi Bechai:* 'Whereas the sinner himself de-'served that his blood should be shed, as the blood 'of the victim was, and that his body should 'be burned, as the carcass of the victim was: and 'God, to whom be praise, accepted this victim as 'his substitute and ransom; see how great was the 'kindness of God towards him! God, of his infinite 'mercy and goodness, for the sinner's expiation, 'accepted the life of a brute instead of his life. This 'sentence is true, and agreeable to reason.'—Isaac Ben Arama:† 'A sinner when he sees his victim 'slain, flayed, cut up, and burned on the altar, 'ought to think with himself, that thus he must have 'been treated, if God had not in mercy accepted a 'sacrifice for his life.'—David de Pomis:‡ 'The 'offerer should consider his victim as substituted in 'his place.'—Isaac Abarbinel:§ 'The offerer de-'served that his blood should be shed and his body 'burned for his sin. But God in mercy accepted 'this victim as his substitute and ransom; and the 'blood of the animal was shed instead of his blood, 'the life of the animal was sacrificed instead of his 'life.' Thus the same author, speaking of the high priest immolating the bullock for his own sin offering: 'Justice required that he should suffer death, 'and that his body and members which had sinned

* Ad Levit. i. † Ad Levit. non procul ab init. ‡ In voce עולה
§ In Præf. ad Levit.

'should be burned; but that his spirit, (because he 'had sinned, not intentionally, but in ignorance,) 'should return to God who gave it. Wherefore it 'was commanded in the law, that he should offer a 'bullock in his stead, and should lay his hands upon 'him, to signify by that rite that the bullock was 'substituted in his place.'

XI. The same doctrine is supported by the uniform exposition which the rabbies have given of the following passage of scripture, upon which we have already made some observations.* "The life of the "flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you "upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: "for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for "the soul." R. Solomon Jarchi says: 'The life of 'every living creature is in the blood: wherefore I 'have given it to make an atonement for your souls: 'life shall come and atone for life.'—Aben Ezra: 'The 'blood makes atonement for the soul; the meaning 'is, life instead of life.'—R. Moses Ben Nachman: 'I have spared the life of man, and have given it,' (the blood,) 'upon the altar, that the life of the 'animal may make an atonement for his life.'—Isaac Ben Arama: 'Since the life of all flesh is in the 'blood, therefore in your sacrifices I have given it 'upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; 'that is, life instead of life.'—Rabbi Lipman: 'As 'in consequence of your sins you deserve to be slain 'and to have your blood shed, I have given the life 'of the victim instead of your lives.'—Isaac Abarbinel: 'It is commanded that every one bring his 'victim before the altar; and the body and flesh of 'the animal shall be instead of the body and flesh of

* Levit. xvii. 11.

'the offerer; and the animal's blood, which is the 'vehicle of the sensitive soul, shall be instead of the 'soul of the man: that is, life instead of life.' In the same sense he calls the bullock that was sacrificed as a sin offering for the high priest, and also the bullock that was immolated as a sin offering for the whole congregation, 'the ransom of the souls of the 'offerers, and the redemption of their bodies.'*—So Aben Ezra† describes a piacular victim as 'an ex-'piation of the punishment due' to the offerer.

XII. If any person, therefore, is desirous of knowing the doctrine that has been held respecting the Jewish piacular sacrifices by the Jews themselves, it has been fully exhibited in the quotations which have been adduced. They have taught that the sins of the offender were transferred to his victim, and that he imprecated upon the victim the punishment due to himself. They have maintained that those victims, whose blood was carried into the sanctuary and whose carcasses were burned without the camp, were polluted by the sins of the guilty being transferred to them. They have described every piacular sacrifice as the ransom, redemption, and substitute, of the sinner himself; and have asserted the life of every such victim to be given instead of the sinner's life. These statements and representations unquestionably imply a belief, that the expiation made by the piacular victims was effected by a vicarious punishment. Sins thus expiated they, nevertheless, described as remitted or forgiven, and that by the infinite mercy of God. For, as is evident from this very circumstance, they were of opinion that no other efficacy was to be attributed to vicarious punishment, but what was

* Ad Levit. iv. † Ad Levit. i.

perfectly consistent with remission of sin, and with God's supreme benevolence in remitting it.

XIII. The opinions held by the Jews concerning their piacular victims, were likewise entertained by the Heathens respecting theirs. They also were accustomed to imprecate upon their victims whatever evils they thought likely to fall upon themselves. They treated those who were employed about piacular victims as polluted by that service. And they considered the lives of the victims as sacrificed instead of the lives of the offerers.

The first of these things is asserted by Herodotus* concerning the Egyptians; whom he describes as accustomed to 'imprecate many things' upon the heads of their victims. He states the form of imprecation to be, 'that if any evil is impending, either over the 'offerers themselves, or over the whole of Egypt, it 'may be turned upon this head:' and adds, 'that 'in every sacrifice all the Egyptians pour a libation 'of wine upon the head of the victim; and that in con-'sequence of this they never taste the head of any 'animal.' The same thing is mentioned by Plutarch:† 'Having imprecated curses on the head of the victim, 'and cut it off, they anciently used to throw it into 'the river, but now they give it to foreigners.'

XIV. As the Egyptians endeavoured to avert calamities from themselves by imprecating them upon the heads of beasts; so the Massilians, the ancient inhabitants of Marseilles, were accustomed to pronounce similar imprecations upon human beings; whom they devoted as piacular sacrifices, from a supposition that the efficacy of every sacrifice would be in proportion to the excellence of the victim:—

* In Euterpe. † De Isid. et Osirid.

a notion which, in ancient times, caused this horrid custom to prevail throughout the world. Servius says:* 'Whenever the Massilians were afflicted with the 'pestilence, one of their poor offered himself, to be fed 'for a whole year with the choicest food, and at the 'public expense; after which, crowned with vervain 'and invested with sacred robes, he was led all over 'the city with imprecations that the calamities of the 'whole state might fall upon him, and then he was 'cast into the sea.' The same practice is stated by Suidas† to have prevailed among the Greeks: 'To 'him who was every year devoted for the averting of 'calamities, they said thus: Be thou our περιψημα, 'that is, our salvation and redemption; and then 'they threw him into the sea, as a sacrifice to Nep-'tune.' The words pronounced on this occasion included both supplication and imprecation. For the custom of other nations in similar cases forbids us to doubt, that in uttering those words they sought their own safety by imprecating on their victim the calamities impending over themselves.

XV. In the next place, as those Jewish victims which were burned without the camp, so, I apprehend, the piacular sacrifices of the Heathens, on account of the sins transferred to them, were considered as polluted themselves, and polluting all who touched them. And it was in consequence of this, for it could hardly have arisen from any other cause, that as the persons who had burned those Jewish victims were not permitted to return into the camp till they had first bathed themselves in water; so it was deemed unlawful for those who were employed about the piacular victims among the Heathens, to

* Ad Æneid. iii. † In voce περιψημα.

return to the city or into their own houses till they had washed themselves in some stream or fountain. 'In this,' Porphyry says in a passage already cited,* 'all theologists agree.'†

XVI. In the last place, as the Jews considered the life of every piacular victim to be sacrificed instead of the life of the sinner, so we are to show that the same opinion was received among the Heathens. This idea is clearly implied in the appellation by which the Greeks designated these victims.‡ Observe also the language of the Scholiast on Aristophanes:§ For the 'Athenians kept some very mean and useless persons, 'and in the time of any calamity, as a plague or the 'like, coming on the city, they, in order to purify 'themselves from the contagion, sacrificed these per-'sons whom they called *purifiers*.'‖ In another place he says:¶ 'Those who were sacrificed to the gods, 'as a lustration or purgation of some pestilence, or 'any other disease, were called *purifiers*.' It is evident that the victims which received this appellation had the same object as those which were distinguished by the other. Nor is there any room to doubt whether the same opinion ought to be formed respecting all the piacular sacrifices offered by the same people and on the same account.

XVII. Plautus introduces one of his characters saying: 'Must I be made an expiation on account of 'thy folly, that thou mayest substitute my back to 'answer for thy folly?' Where he represents expiation to consist in suffering vicarious punishment for another's offence. Take another passage from the

* C. xvii. §. 2. † De Abstin. L. ii. c. 44.

‡ Περιψημα, which Hesychius explains by αντιψυχον, *life substituted for life.*

§ Ad Equites. ‖ Καθαρματα. ¶ Ad Plutum.

same poet: 'When thou art thyself the guilty per-
'son, why does a victim die in thy stead?' Cæsar in his account of the Gauls says:* 'The whole 'nation is very much devoted to religious rites. And 'for that reason, those who are afflicted with grievous 'diseases, and those who are going to battles, or in-'volved in dangers, either sacrifice other human vic-'tims, or vow that they will sacrifice themselves; and 'the ministers employed by them in these sacrifices are 'the Druids: because they believe, that the majesty 'of the immortal gods cannot be propitiated, unless 'the life of man be sacrificed for the life of man.' But least of all must we omit what Porphyry states from Asclepiades:† 'At first no animal was sacrificed to 'the gods. Nor was there any law for this, which 'was forbidden by the law of nature. But the first 'animal sacrifice is said to have been offered on 'some occasion requiring life instead of life.'‡ This passage implies that it was commonly believed in ancient times, that animal sacrifices were only introduced on some occasion which was thought to demand *life for life.* Such occasions the Heathens considered all seasons of apprehended calamity; as is evident from the same author. For those sacrifices in which he asserts a substitution of life for life, he had just before described as offered 'for the averting of some 'calamities.'§

XVIII. If there is any weight, therefore, in the entire agreement of Christians and Jews, and even of Heathens, on this subject, though otherwise differing most widely in manners and religion; no doubt can remain, that the piacular victims were the subjects of

* De Bello Gall. L. vi. c. 16. † De Abstinen. L. iv. c. 15.

‡ Ψυχην αντι ψυχης. § Εις αποτροπην τινων κακων.

vicarious punishment. Yet let it be remembered, as I have already remarked, that vicarious suffering is not to be considered as punishment in the same strict sense as that which is the precise penalty of the law, and is inflicted upon the sinner in his own person; and that it possesses not the same natural efficacy in cancelling guilt, but operates as a condition, designed and adapted to restore and preserve the authority of the violated law, and to obtain pardon for the sinner.

DISSERTATION II.

ON THE

SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

The general Business of Christ's Priesthood; the Order to which it belongs; and the Things by which he was especially consecrated to this Office.

THE subject of this Dissertation being the Sacrifice of Christ, I conceive it cannot be improper to make a few preliminary observations respecting his priesthood:—in the first place, on the general business of this office; secondly, on the order to which it belongs; and lastly, on the things by which he was especially consecrated to it.

The general business of his priesthood must be defined—an advocacy or mediation with God on the behalf of men. While his other offices, regal and prophetical, are exercised toward men, his priesthood is exercised toward God. For a king is God's vicegerent, and every prophet is his ambassador to men; but a priest is an advocate for men with God. Hence we are said to "have Jesus Christ" as "an advocate "with the Father;"* Christ is said to "make inter-"cession for us at the right hand of God,"† and "to "appear in the presence of God for us."‡ But, as these things will be more fully explained in another place, the mere mention of them is sufficient here.

* I John ii. 1. † Rom. viii. 34. ‡ Heb. ix. 24.

II. The order of Christ's priesthood is explicitly declared in the scriptures, which describe him as "a "priest after the order of Melchisedec," and specify two important points of difference between his priesthood and that of Aaron. First, the priesthood of Melchisedec, that great man of whom no history records the genealogy, or the birth, or the death, was confined to no particular family; but the priesthood of Aaron was committed exclusively to his family by a divine law. Secondly, the priesthood of Melchisedec was of such a nature, that the person invested with it would be a priest for ever, either in a shadowy figurative sense, in which Melchisedec, as we have before observed, is declared to be a priest for ever; or in a true and perfect sense, such as the eternity of the priesthood of Christ. He will exercise this office in every age of the world; nor, as long as his advocacy or mediation shall be needed by his people, will he ever desert or discontinue it. In the priesthood of Aaron, on the contrary, those who died were succeeded by others in a continual series; and the office itself has long since been abolished in his family.

The opinion entertained by some,—that the sacrifices offered by Aaron were of a different kind from those which were offered by Melchisedec, that Aaron offered animals as well as inanimate things, and that Melchisedec offered nothing but bread and wine,—appears to me to have no foundation. Melchisedec gave bread and wine to Abraham and his servants, on their return from a battle, in order to recruit their exhausted strength.* And the sacred history contains plain intimations of the existence of a similar custom in that and the neighbouring countries on

* Gen. xiv. 18.

such occasions.* Nor is Melchisedec called a priest, because he "brought forth bread and wine;" but to account for his solemn benediction of Abraham, which was part of the priestly office,† and also for Abraham's giving him a tenth of the spoils. "He," says Moses,‡ "was the priest of the most high God. "And he blessed him" (Abraham) "and said, Blessed "be Abram of the most high God, possessor of "heaven and earth: And blessed be the most high "God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine "hand. And he gave him tithes of all."

There is no ground therefore, for the supposition that Melchisedec sacrificed nothing but bread and wine, or none but inanimate things; but sufficient reason for a contrary opinion. For, if his priesthood had nothing to do with bloody sacrifices, how came it to pass that Christ himself, whose priesthood is declared to be of the same kind as that of Melchisedec, offered his sacrifice by shedding his own blood?

Nor should we pay any attention to those who attribute to Christ a priesthood of the order of Aaron as well as of that of Melchisedec, and suppose that he offered a sacrifice by blood in the character of an Aaronic priest. The advocates of this opinion produce nothing sufficient to justify such a representation. It is repugnant to the express language of scripture; which affirms that the priesthood of Christ was "NOT "after the order of Aaron,"§ and assigns this reason, that Christ descended from another family, and a different tribe, from that to which the Aaronic priesthood was confined by an inviolable law.

* Deut. xxiii. 4. Jud. viii. 5, 6. 15. † Deut. xxi. 5. ‡ Chron. xxiii. 13. Num. vi. 23. ‡ Gen. xiv. 17—19. § Heb. vii. 11.

III. Our next inquiry respects those things by which the Son of God, the eternal Word, on his assumption of our nature, was initiated into his priesthood. It was in a very different way from that in which the Aaronic priests were consecrated to their office. They were consecrated by ablutions with purifying water, by cloathing with prescribed vestments, by an ointment composed of various perfumes, and by the blood of slaughtered beasts:* by which the virtues required in a priest were emblematically represented, but could not be conferred. But when God would have his Son to be a priest possessed of every qualification in absolute perfection, no one can doubt but he would initiate him into his priesthood by those very things which constitute such a priest. This being the case, let us examine,—first, wherein the absolute perfection of a priest consists; and in the next place, by what things Christ, as Mediator, attained that perfection: for it is evident that by those very things he must have been consecrated to the priesthood.

IV. To constitute a priest absolutely perfect, the three following things are indispensably necessary. *First*, he must have sufficient authority and favour with God, to be able effectually to commend all his people to him, and to render him propitious to them. *Secondly*, he must feel sufficient kindness and mercy towards men, to be inclined to a sedulous attention to these objects. *Lastly*, he must possess an immortal life, to be capable of the perpetual performance of them. The necessity of the first of these requisites, in a perfect priest, appears from the design of the office itself. For as it is the business of a

* See Diss. I. Chap. V.

priest, as an advocate, to commend to God those whose cause he undertakes, and to render God propitious to them;* no one can attain perfection in the sacerdotal office, who has not sufficient favour and authority with God to be able to accomplish these objects. Nor, in reference to the second of these requisites, can any one be a perfect priest, who, whatever may be the influence of his favour and authority with God, is not willing to use it all in the cause of his people. For he would be deficient in that fidelity and mercy toward his people, which are necessary in every priest, and especially in every high priest of superior excellence. The scriptures give us this very idea.† "For," says the apostle to the Hebrews, "every high priest taken from among men "is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, "that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins: "who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on "them that are out of the way: for that he himself "also is compassed with infirmity."‡ "Wherefore "in all things it behoved" Christ, as the same apostle had before said, "to be made like unto his brethren, "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people:" which fully implies that in every priest no qualities are more necessary than mercy and fidelity. But the last requisite is equally indispensable in a perfect priest; who must be possessed of an immortal life, to be capable of perpetually defending and maintaining the cause of his people before God. Hence the following expressions of the same apostle when speaking of Christ:§ "But this man, because he "continueth ever, hath unchangeable priesthood.

* I John ii. 1, 2. † Heb, v. 1, 2. ‡ Heb. ii. 17. § Heb. vii. 24, 25, 26. 28.

"Wherefore he is able also to save them to the "uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he "ever liveth to make intercession for them. For "such an high priest became us, who is holy, harm-"less, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made "higher than the heavens.—For the law maketh men "high priests which have infirmity; but the word of "the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, "who is consecrated for evermore."

Since it is sufficiently evident, therefore, that the greatest authority and favour with God, and the greatest mercy and fidelity toward men, combined with an immortal life, render a priest absolutely perfect; there can be no doubt that by those things by which Christ attained all these requisites, by those very things he was also consecrated to his priesthood. Now those things, as every one must perceive, were Christ's pre-eminent excellencies, the perfect sanctity of his life, and principally that obedience which consisted in voluntarily surrendering himself to death, and freely submitting to those extreme pains and sorrows which he endured on account of our sins. For it is in consequence of these things, that Christ has so much favour and authority with God as to be able effectually to commend to him all his people. His willingness to do it is also the result of the same things. For he has learned by experience, what it is to be a man; what it is to bear hunger, thirst, poverty, and the deepest ignominy; what it is to be deserted by friends, to be rejected by others, to be the sport of all the basest of men; what it is to be assailed, harrassed, and oppressed, by dangers of every kind; and lastly, as the consummation of calamity, what it is to suffer the most excruciating death on account of

our sins. From an experience of these things, he has acquired such benevolence and compassion towards his people under all their afflictions and temptations, that he is ready to afford them assistance himself, and desirous that they may obtain abundant mercy from God in all circumstances. Hence the following language of the apostle to the Hebrews:* "Seeing then "that we have a great high priest, that is passed into "the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold "fast our profession. For we have not an high "priest which cannot be touched with the feeling "of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted "like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we "may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time "of need."—In the last place, those who have put their trust in him, have no reason to fear that they shall ever be deprived of their advocate. For by his voluntary submission to death he has obtained an immortal life, on his attainment of which he is said to be perfected, or consecrated to an eternal priesthood after the order of Melchisedec. Thus the apostle to the Hebrews:† "And being made perfect, "he became the author of eternal salvation to all "them that obey him; called of God an high priest "after the order of Melchisedec." Whence we conclude, that it was on his resurrection from the dead to an immortal life, that the Son of God was fully consecrated to the perpetual priesthood. For there is no doubt that the word here rendered "being "made perfect" means *fully and perfectly consecrated.* This is evident, both from the scope of the passage, which relates to this very point, and from

* Heb. iv. 14—16. † Heb. iv. 9, 10.

the use of the same word in a similar sense on a similar occasion; this being the term adopted by the Septuagint in various places to designate the consecration of the Aaronic priests,* and the victim whose entrails were delivered by Moses into the hands of the priests as a sign of the priesthood committed to them.†

* Exod. xxix. 9. 33. 35. Levit. viii. 33. xvi. 32.

† Κριος τελειωσεως. Exod. xxix. 27. 31. 34. Levit. viii. 21. 28.

CHAPTER II.

Proofs that the Scriptures attribute to Christ a real Priesthood, properly so called.

WE have already defined the general business of Christ's priesthood to be an advocacy with God on the behalf of men, and observed, that it is primarily and immediately exercised towards God. This we learn from the very design of the sacerdotal office. But the followers of Socinus suppose that our Lord performed all things pertaining to our salvation by himself in such a manner, that he neither now obtains, nor ever has obtained, any thing from God for us from his first entrance on his priestly office: so that they attribute to Christ no priesthood but such as is improperly so called. This opinion is equally contrary to the language of scripture, and to the nature and design of the priesthood. Whoever consults the sacred volume will find the priesthood of Christ invariably mentioned as a priesthood properly so called. Thus speaks the apostle to the Hebrews:* "If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Here, from the priesthood conferred upon Christ, the apostle concludes, that there must have been a change of the law which had conferred the sacerdotal office exclusively on the family of Aaron. But this conclusion could not possibly be

* Heb. vii. 11, 12.

be drawn, unless the priesthood of our Lord possesses the proper nature and design of the priesthood, and he is a priest properly so called. For there were always many priests improperly so called, even while the law of Moses relative to the priesthood was yet in full force. Such priests were those who offered *spiritual* sacrifices, or prayers to God. Such priests were all the faithful among the Jews, and even the whole Israelitish nation is called "a kingdom of "priests."* Since, therefore, there were many priests improperly so called, even while the law which confided the sacerdotal office exclusively to the family of Aaron was yet in full force; and our Lord could not be such a priest as he actually is, unless that law had been abrogated; it clearly follows that his priesthood is a priesthood properly so called.

II. The same conclusion may be drawn from another passage:† "For if he were on earth, he "should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests "that offer gifts according to the law." On these words Crellius observes:‡ 'He gives a reason for 'what he has asserted, that is, why Christ could not 'be a priest if he were to minister on earth. It is 'because there are already other priests appointed 'by God, who minister and offer gifts on earth: 'Christ neither is nor can be one of these, as has 'been shown in the preceding chapter. Now they 'are said to offer gifts according to the law, because 'the law has granted to them the exclusive right and 'privilege, so that no one, without violating the law, 'can arrogate to himself the right of offering gifts 'on earth, or ministering in the earthly sanctuary.' What is the reason of this? Because, if we attend

* Exod. xix. 6. † Heb. viii. 4. ‡ In Com. ad loc.

to Crellius, the priesthood of Christ is of such a nature as is prohibited to him to administer on earth, by that law which conferred on the family of Aaron the sole right of exercising the priesthood on earth. But that law contained no prohibition inconsistent with Christ's having even on earth a metaphorical priesthood, and being a priest improperly so called. For while that law was in force, there were many such priests even on earth; and Christ himself performed the duty of such a priesthood, whenever he commended either himself or his people to God in his prayers. Since Christ, therefore, possesses such a priesthood as by the Mosaic law could not be executed by him on earth, though he was at liberty to exercise on earth a metaphorical priesthood, it clearly follows that our Lord is a priest properly so called.

III. To the passages already cited we may add the following:* "For every high priest is ordained "to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of "necessity that this man have somewhat also to "offer." But this reasoning of the apostle must appear to be altogether inconclusive, unless Christ, who is here spoken of, has a priesthood properly so called. For every priest improperly so called is always provided with somewhat to offer to God; holiness of heart, chastity of body, prayers, and thanksgivings. And this was so well known to the Hebrews that there could be no ground for the apostle to argue with them in this manner, unless he intended to attribute to Christ a priesthood properly so called.

IV. And since this apostle frequently gives Christ the title of high priest, he must be considered as

* Heb viii. 3.

attributing to him the office itself, and that in a true and proper sense, unless any thing can be alleged on the contrary, to shew that such an office is altogether incompatible with his character. But neither Socinus himself, nor even Crellius, who has laboured in this controversy more than all the other disciples of Socinus, has adduced any proof of such incompatibility. Let us briefly notice the observations which Crellius makes on this subject. He says:* 'You 'never find these two offices, the regal and pontifical, 'plainly divided, or according to the language of the 'schools, contradistinguished from each other, in the 'scriptures; but you may rather observe them com-'prehended as it were in each other. For the author 'of the epistle to the Hebrews, at the beginning of 'the third chapter, intending to exhibit to our view 'the dignity of Christ, which he possesses in conse-'quence of the office committed to him by God, and 'exhorting us to a consideration of him, mentions 'only his two offices, prophetical and sacerdotal. 'The former of these offices he once fulfilled on 'earth, the latter he speaks of as to be perpetually 'administered in heaven; "Wherefore, holy brethren, 'partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the 'Apostle," or Ambassador, "and High Priest of our 'profession Christ Jesus." These and other similar remarks of Crellius are all without foundation. For the sacred writers never comprehend, either the kingdom of Christ in his priesthood, or his priesthood in his kingdom; but always distinguish and discriminate between these really disinct offices. Nor is the apostle to the Hebrews correctly cited in support of the contrary sentiment. When he called

* Contra Grot. c. x. p. 55.

Christ an "apostle" and "high priest," omitting the title of king, he only intended to say, that in the church of God, Christ once fulfilled the part of Moses, and now fulfils the part of Aaron; the former as an apostle or ambassador, and the latter as a high priest. He treats of the former in this passage in which he compares him with Moses, and afterwards proceeds to an explication of the latter* when he compares him with Aaron. He had already adverted to Christ's kingly office,† nor was there any reason for repeating in this place what he had advanced but just before.

V. But Crellius argues:‡ 'The other writers of 'the New Testament rather mention the kingly and 'prophetical offices of Christ, nor does either of them 'ever call him a priest or high priest, as without 'doubt they would very frequently have done, if this 'office on which our eternal salvation depends, could 'not be understood and tacitly comprehended in his 'other offices, and especially in his regal one, consi-'dering certain circumstances of those offices, in 'which Christ resembles a legal priest.' As though it were impossible for Christ to possess a sacerdotal office properly so called, unless *many* of the sacred writers give him the *name* of priest.

But do many of them give him the *name*, either of prophet, or of king? This is by no means the case. There is no passage in the apostolical epistles in which Christ is expressly called, either a king, or a prophet; though our eternal salvation depends also upon the offices which are designated by those words. The Apostle to the Hebrews has twice called him a *captain*, *leader*, or *author*;§ but he has given him

* Heb. iv. 5. † Heb. i. 2 ‡ Contra Grot. c. x. p. 55.
§ Heb. ii. 10. "The *captain* of salvation." xii. 2. "The *author* of

the title of *priest* seven times, and that of *high priest* ten times.

But, it will be said, the apostolical epistles attribute to Christ such things as belong to a king and prophet, though they do not introduce those words. This is true. And they likewise attribute to him things peculiar to a high priest, notwithstanding the omission of that name. To pass over other instances, this is the case where Christ is said to be our *advocate*, or to *intercede for us*. Nor is there any weight in what is afterwards asserted by Crellius;* 'that 'the apostle Paul, in the intercession of Christ, com-'prehends the exercise of his regal power for our de-'liverance from punishment, as well as any imme-'diate effect of his intercession.' For in the passage to which Crellius refers, "Who is at the right hand "of God, who also maketh intercession for us,—" the apostle intends to assert these two things: first, that Christ possesses the most exalted dignity and the highest favour with God, as being seated at his right hand: secondly, that he who enjoys such exalted dignity, and such great favour with God, is pleading our cause before him. And this belongs not to the kingdom of Christ, but to his priesthood, as will be more fully demonstrated in another place.

VI. But there is another passage also with which Crellius has found himself not a little embarrassed. He says:† "When John stiles Christ the advocate 'whom we have with the Father, and at the same 'time calls him the propitiation for our sins,‡ he may 'be considered as having given us a description of 'his sacerdotal office, where he has nevertheless

"faith." The original word is the same in both these places; Αρχηγος.

* Ubi supra. † Ibid. ‡ I John ii. 1, 2.

'made no mention of the kingly office. But since it 'forms a part of the consolation, which John here 'proposes to those who sin, to know that Christ 'has the most ample power to deliver us from the 'punishment of sins, he must be considered as having 'tacitly included the kingly office in the words he 'has used.' What? is it usual with the other sacred writers, when they mention any one particular topic of consolation to the fallen, to accumulate at the same time all the topics that may in any respect conduce to the same end? was there any necessity for this apostle to introduce every consideration tending to console the fallen, in this one passage; so as to oblige us to consider him as having asserted what is by no means implied in his words? For the original term here used* signifies, not a king, but an advocate or patron, whose office it is to plead with one person the cause of another. This Christ performs for us, not in the character of a king, but as our high priest in the presence of God. The apostle, therefore, intended to propose to the fallen no consolations but such as result from the high priesthood of Christ; and those he has proposed most clearly and distinctly. But the consolations arising from Christ's kingly office, he neither has glanced at, nor can be considered as having intended to glance at, in this passage; unless we are determined to fix upon his words, meanings which are not conveyed by them. But if it is lawful to treat the sacred writers in this manner, we may ascribe to them at our own pleasure those senses which are not expressed by their words; indeed every individual will attribute to the scriptures, and will think himself at liberty to at-

* Παρακλητος.

tribute to them, such notions as may be agreeable to his own particular fancy. But if this licence be once granted, what limits can ever be placed to such folly and profanation?

VII. The assertion of Crellius,* 'that whatever 'we expect from Christ as a priest, may be said to 'come from him as a king,' has not the least appearance of truth. It is expected from him altogether in the character of a priest, that he commend us and our services to God, and procure his favour towards us. But no one ever sought this from him in the character of a king. Crellius, therefore, argues to no purpose, when he says, that 'Christ vanquishes 'and destroys sin, death, and Satan, his and our 'enemies, as a king,' and 'that this is to expiate 'and purge away sins, which is the part of a priest:' and again, 'that it is the part of Christ, as a king, 'to succour his people who flee for refuge to his 'throne, and to help the afflicted; but that it is his 'part also, as a priest, to afford help in time of need 'to them who approach the throne of grace, and 'readily to succour those who are afflicted.'† Christ succours us in one way as a king, and in another as a priest. As a king, he confers upon us those things which pertain to eternal salvation: as a priest, he commends us and our prayers to God. He acts the part of a king to *us*, and that of a priest to *God*. As his regal office is exercised towards us, his sacerdotal one is exercised towards God.

VIII. 'But the inspired writer of the epistle to 'the Hebrews,' says Crellius,‡ 'clearly refers that pas-'sage of the second psalm, "Thou art my Son, this 'day have I begotten thee," to the priesthood of

* Ubi supra. † Heb. ii. 17, 18. iv. 15, 16. ‡ Ubi supra. Heb. v. 5.

'Christ, and shews that the pontifical dignity was 'thus conferred upon him by God. But these words 'as clearly relate to Christ's kingly office. For 'David, who was a type of Christ, exhibits in these 'words the divine decree, by which after a long exile 'he was actually constituted king, and seated on the 'royal throne; as any one will perceive on a perusal 'of the psalm. Hence Paul declares them to have 'been accomplished at the resurrection of Christ 'from the dead.* For then God gave his people a 'king according to his promises, and constituted Jesus 'both Lord and Christ, or, which is the same thing, 'the Son of God with power.' But whatever was the meaning of these words, "Thou art my Son, this "day have I begotten thee," as applied to David; when they are transferred to Christ, they signify his being raised from the dead by God to an immortal life. And the attainment of this immortal life being equally necessary to the discharge of the priestly and the kingly office by Christ in heaven; consequently, these same words, which certainly designate the resurrection of Christ to an immortal life, may be applied, and are indeed actually applied, to both offices: to the regal, in the first chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews; to the sacerdotal, in the fifth chapter. Nor are these two offices, distinct both in name and in fact, on this account confounded into one. For nothing more frequently happens, than that things, which are widely different have yet something in common. And the kingdom and priesthood of Christ have this in common, that both being equally perpetual, each requires an immortal life.

IX. Crellius also urges,† that it is impossible for

* Acts xiii. 32, 33. † Contra Grot. c. x. p. 54.

'Christ to be really and properly a king and judge, 'and also an advocate or priest.' To this observation we at present answer; That Christ is a king to us, and a priest to God; that as a king he rules us by his laws and by his power, assists us with the aids of his Holy Spirit, and is near at hand on all occasions: that as a priest he commends us and our prayers to God; us when he desires God to be propitious to us, and our prayers when he desires God to accept them. But these his desires are not conveyed in humble petitions, but expressed with that authority which becomes the dignity of his person. Yet this authority must be considered as not interfering with or diminishing the dominion and authority of God the Father. For he who hath put all other things under Christ, hath not made himself subject to him,* nor hath he communicated his kingdom to him, as Mediator, in such a manner as to have abdicated it himself; so as to render it no longer of any importance to us, whether the Father is propitious to our persons and accepts our prayers. If this is of no importance, why do we address prayers to him that he may be pleased to regard us with mercy? Why have the apostles, why have all Christians, done the same in every age? But if it is of the highest importance to our interest, that God be propitious to us, it is also of importance that our high priest Jesus Christ, who certainly has the greatest authority and favour with God, should desire that God be propitious to us.

There is no weight therefore, in the following argument of Crellius;† 'Since God has given to Christ 'all power in heaven and in earth, for the express

* I Corinth. xv. 27. † Ubi supra.

'purpose, that he may bestow upon us remission of 'sins and eternal life, and may cherish us who are 'his members with his perpetual aid, why should he 'still plead with God and intercede with him that he 'would be pleased to forgive us our sins?' This, I say, is an argument of no weight. For we suppose not that Jesus our high priest uses any humble or supplicant intercession, but the most powerful commendation of us and our prayers, such as becomes his character. Nor is it unimportant that God remit our sins, if by remission of sins, signifies the mercy or favour of the Divine Mind towards us. For let his mind be hostile to us, and what greater or heavier evil can befal us? Do we imagine that Christ will be propitious to those to whom his Father is hostile? It is, therefore, of the utmost importance, that God be propitious to us; and of equal importance, that Christ desire him to be propitious to us; unless it be maintained, either that the beloved Son has no authority and favour with the Father, or that we need no commendation before God. Either of these suppositions would be contradictory to St. John. For what is his language? "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the "propitiation for our sins."* Here he teaches us that Christ is our advocate, and a most powerful advocate with the Father, and that we have the greatest need of such a potent advocate. We reply, in the last place, that Christ administers his kingdom according to the will of God, and bestows eternal salvation only on those whom the Father also determines to save. And thus the persons on whom he

* I John ii. 1, 2.

chooses to bestow eternal salvation, them he also commends to God the Father.

To conclude this argument, therefore: since Christ is expressly called a priest in the scriptures, and since nothing can be adduced to justify our denying him the real office which that term imports, the necessary conclusion is, that the priesthood of Christ is a priesthood properly so called.

If any person, relying upon new subtleties should say, that the priesthood of Christ is indeed immediately exercised towards God, and that Christ commends us and our prayers to God, but that this is no proof of his having a true and real priesthood; such a person, admitting the thing, would raise a dispute about a name, the most vain of all controversies; and would discover more subtlety than Crellius himself: for to divest Christ of a true and real priesthood, is no other than to deny that he exercises immediately towards God any office at all. Having made these observations respecting the Priesthood of Christ, we now proceed to his Sacrifice.

CHAPTER III.

To what Class of Sacrifices the Sacrifice of Christ belongs, and in what it consists.

THE sacrifices prescribed to the Jewish people were of various classes. Some were burnt offerings; others, piacular offerings; others, peace offerings; others, similar to the peace offerings, yet not precisely the same: there were also different kinds, both of piacular offerings, and of peace offerings: of all which we have treated in the first Dissertation. If it be inquired to which class the Sacrifice of Christ belongs, the scriptures will easily determine this question. He is declared to have "put away sin by "the sacrifice of himself," to have "by himself "purged our sins," to have "sanctified the people "with his own blood," and to have "offered" to God "one sacrifice for sins:"* whence it is evident that his sacrifice belongs to the piacular class. I apprehend, however, that we are indebted to his sacrifice, not only for pardon of sins, but also for the aids of the Holy Spirit, and all other things pertaining to our eternal salvation; these blessings having been procured by his blood. For as all the sacrifices of the Jews, accumulated together, were offered in order to obtain the benefits of the present life; so I consider the one sacrifice of Christ as having procured all things relating to eternal life. And I am confirmed in this opinion, because all the sacrifices of the Jews, though with various degrees of clearness or obscurity, prefigured the sacrifice of Christ. Nor is it to be wondered at if that sacrifice, which procures

* Heb. ix. 26. i. 3. xiii. 12. x. 12.

for us with God the grace connected with eternal life, should also procure every thing else necessary to our attainment of that life.

II. Having ascertained to what class the sacrifice of Christ must be referred, we proceed to show in what it consists. And never having seen this subject sufficiently explained, we shall be the more careful in discussing it. To this end it is necessary to remember, that the victims whose carcasses were burned without the camp typified the sacrifice of Christ more evidently than any others; and that among these victims, those whose blood was sprinkled in the holy of holies on the day of atonement, did this more clearly than those whose blood was only carried as occasion required, into the outer sanctuary: but on these things we have sufficiently enlarged in the first Dissertation.

Those victims, therefore, with which the sacrifice of Christ must be compared as its most eminent types, were the young bullock and he goat, the former offered in sacrifice for the high priest and the family of Aaron, the other for the whole congregation of the people, on the day of atonement. These victims were first brought by the high priest himself to the altar that stood in the court of the priests. In the next place, being thus offered to God, for the victim was offered at the time of its being placed before the altar; they were slain by him near the same altar. After this he carried their blood into the innermost sanctuary, and sprinkled it, as we have elsewhere stated, burned the entrails upon the altar, and took care that the bodies should be wholly consumed by fire without the camp, or without the city of Jerusalem. In imbruing the altar with the blood and entrails, the

high priest acted in his own pontifical character; but in offering and slaying the victims, he represented the whole nation. For in the sacrifices of individuals, every one was commanded to bring his own victim to the altar, to consecrate or devote it with his own hand, and then to slay it. Hence it is evident that those who performed these offices, which were performed, sometimes by some of the elders, sometimes by the high priest himself, respecting the sacrifices offered on behalf of the whole congregation, manifestly represented that congregation during their discharge of such services.

III. From the rites connected with those sacrifices, which beyond all others pre-eminently typified the sacrifice of Christ, it is plain that Christ accomplished his sacrifice by three things:—*By his voluntary oblation of himself to a bloody death,—by his death itself,—and by his entrance into heaven as a victim that had been slain*, and with a mind so disposed towards men, as to commend them to God.

The *first* of these things, in which his sacrifice consisted, the Son of God performed, when he voluntarily offered himself to the Father to undergo the death which awaited him. This we learn, both from his words and actions on that occasion. In the *first* place, when he was about to die, his language was;* "For their sakes I sanctify myself;" that is, as the word *sanctify* sometimes imports,† and as it must necessarily be understood here, according to the explanation of Chrysostom,‡ 'I offer myself to thee

* John xvii. 19.

† The word αγιαζω, like the Hebrew קדש is sometimes equivalent to προσφερω. See Septuag. *Levit.* xxii. 2, 3. I *Chron.* xxiii. 13.

‡ Ad loc. Homil. 72.

'as a sacrifice.'* *In the next place*, it must be observed, that the prayers with which Christ consecrated or devoted himself to his death,† were in some respect similar to those with which we have shown in another place, that the Jewish high priest consecrated or offered the victims to God before the altar on the day of atonement. For as the high priest, when he offered those victims to God, prayed for salvation, first, on behalf of himself and his own family; secondly, for all the family of Aaron; and lastly, for the whole congregation: so Christ, when consecrating himself to death, commended to God in solemn prayers, first, himself; secondly, his apostles; and lastly, all who should afterwards believe on him. Hence it is inferred, that when our Lord uttered these prayers he then offered himself to God as a victim, typified by the victims already mentioned. *In the last place* he verified all this by his own act. For as soon as he had finished these prayers, he voluntarily went to the very place,‡ whence he knew that he should immediately be led to judgment, and then to the cross, to be slain as an expiatory sacrifice: so that, beyond all doubt, the words "I sanctify "myself," were equivalent to saying: 'I offer myself 'to be slain as a piacular victim.'

The *second* of those things in which his sacrifice consisted, our Lord accomplished, when he suffered death for our sins without the city of Jerusalem, where those victims used to be burned, which were his most eminent types.

* TR.—The same explanation is given by Cyril of Alexandria, who paraphrases the clause thus: 'I present and devote myself an offering without spot to God even the Father.' *De Adorat.* L. x. et alibi. *Apud Suicer. Thesaur.* tom. 1, col. 56.

† John xvii. ‡ John xviii. 1. xvii. 1.

The *last* was accomplished by him, when entering heaven, typified by the holy of holies, in the character of our high priest, as well as of the victim slain for our sins, he appeared in the presence of God, and that with such a disposition of mind toward us, as to desire that God would be most propitious to us. For as the high priest of the Jews carried the blood (the vehicle of the life or sensitive soul) of the victims into the innermost sanctuary of the temple, as a sign of the previous immolation of them, and sprinkled it towards the mercy-seat: so our high priest, in heaven itself which that sanctuary prefigured, presents before God, not only the soul, but also the body, of the victim that was slain for our sins. If any one chooses to call this entrance of Christ into the heavenly sanctuary, his *oblation* of himself, I shall be far from opposing it. Indeed I consider it in this light myself; yet at the same time I maintain that Christ also offered himself as an expiatory victim, when he gave himself up to die. For, as we have before stated, there was a twofold oblation of sacrifices; *one*, of the victim while yet alive; which in the sacrifices of individuals was performed by the offerers themselves, and in the sacrifices of the whole congregation, either by elders, or by the high priest on behalf of the congregation: the *other*, of the blood and entrails after the victim had been slain; which was performed by the priest. In the sacrifice of Christ, his voluntary oblation of himself to death corresponds to the former; his presentation of himself before God in heaven, as a victim that had been slain, resembles the latter; for the blood of those victims which were the principal types of Christ, was carried into the holy of holies which typified heaven itself.

IV. In these things, in which the sacrifice of Christ consisted, he sustained the threefold character, of *offerer*, *victim*, and *high priest*. Of offerer on our behalf, and likewise of victim about to be slain, in his oblation of himself to death; of victim also in death itself: lastly of high priest, and of a victim already slain for our sins, on his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary. For there he now appears in the presence of God in both characters, and by the efficacy of his sacrifice, as our high priest, he commends us and our services to God. And as the high priest of the Jews, when offering before the altar the victims for the whole congregation previously to their being slain, acted not so much in his pontifical character, as in that of representative of the congregation: so I consider Christ, in his oblation of himself to death, to have acted not so much in the capacity of high priest, as in that of our representative. For in the sacrifices of individuals, as we have more than once already observed, it was the business of the offerers themselves to bring their victims to the altar, and then to offer or consecrate them to God. It is evident, therefore, that those who performed these offices in the sacrifices of the whole congregation, while performing them, represented the whole congregation. Hence it follows, that our Lord also, in his oblation of himself to death, acted not in the character of high priest, but as our representative; just as the Jewish high priest, in offering before the altar the victims about to be slain on behalf of the whole congregation, acted not in his peculiar character of high priest, but as the representative of that congregation.

CHAPTER IV.

The Efficacy of that Obedience which Christ rendered to God in offering himself to die.

HAVING ascertained these things in which we conclude the sacrifice of our Lord to consist, we proceed to shew in what respects each of them contributes to our eternal salvation. To do this in the order which has just been proposed, we have to consider,—First, the obedience which Christ rendered to God in voluntarily offering himself to a bloody death:—Secondly, his death itself:—and Lastly, his entrance into heaven with a mind so disposed towards men as to commend them to God by the efficacy of his sacrifice, and to do for them every thing becoming the best of all advocates.

By voluntarily offering himself to die, Christ performed many things conducing to our salvation, which he never could have accomplished by his death, if that death had not been voluntary. It would not have been possible for him by an involuntary death, either to confirm the truth of his gospel, or to give his disciples an example of obedience to God and love to men, or to obtain from God universal and sovereign power, and supreme favour with him; in the former of which consists the strength of his kingdom, and in the latter the efficacy of his priesthood. But by his voluntary death all these things have been fully accomplished.

II. By freely offering himself to a painful death, Christ confirmed his gospel, as a *martyr* or solemn witness. Hence his "blood" is said to "bear witness"*

* I John v. 8.

concerning the truth of the gospel. This effect of the death of Christ is intended by St. Paul, when he states that he "witnessed a good confession before "Pontius Pilate."* When the same apostle, speaking of the many sufferings, which he had himself endured and was yet to undergo for the confirmation of the gospel, says,† "I fill up in my flesh that which is "behind of the afflictions of Christ:" he refers, not to the piacular character of Christ's death, but to that effect which it had in common with the death of any martyr.

To have a correct idea of the confirmation given to the gospel by Christ's voluntary oblation of himself to the most cruel of deaths, it is necessary to consider that he asserted many things respecting himself, which, if they had been false, he must have known to be false, and to have been fictions of his own. He declared that he was "*the Christ*," "the "light of the world," the prophet of whom "*the* "*scriptures*" had "testified," of whom "*Moses* "*wrote*;" that "power was given to him over all "flesh," and "all judgment committed to him;" that he would "raise up" all his people "at the last "day."‡ All these things, not to mention others, were such as, if they had not been true, it would have been impossible for him to believe to be true, unless he had been insane. But Christ was always in a state of perfect sanity, and was satisfied of the truth of these declarations, as well as of every thing else that he uttered. This is proved, in the first place, by the consummate wisdom of his declarations and his undeviating constancy through his whole life; and in the

* 1 Tim. vi. 13. † Col. i. 24.

‡ Mark xiv. 61, 62. John viii. 12. v. 39. 46. xvii. 2. v. 22. vi. 40.

next place, by his patient submission to a most cruel death with the greatest firmness and equanimity. Christ went to his death, and endured its agonies, in a manner that exhibited no appearance of inconstancy or levity, no indication of fraud or cunning; but, as will soon be evinced, furnished many striking evidences, both of obedience to God, and of love to man. Unless Christ had been conscious of his integrity, he would have had no motive to hazard his safety by teaching a new religion, equally disliked and hated by Jews and Gentiles. He could not be excited to this by any hope of pleasures, honours, or riches: no such hope was entertained by him, who before his death clearly foresaw and foretold, that on this very account he should be deprived of all the accommodations of this life and even of life itself. Nor could he have been influenced by the hope of a new sect to be established after his death, and of glory to arise from it to his name, if he had been conscious to himself of any fraud. He had declared that he was to be raised from the dead on the third day. If he had been conscious of falsehood, he must have known that this would not come to pass: for what deceiver can expect to work miracles in confirmation of a falsehood? and he must also have known, that, if it did not come to pass, his fraud would then be evident to all, and no person would be so weak as to choose for the guide of his life a man convicted of manifest fraud; especially when exile, ignominy, and death in various forms presented themselves to his followers, and menaced them on every side.

The sum of what we have said is this. Christ uttered many declarations concerning himself, which, if they had not been altogether true, he must have

known to be false, unless he had been insane. Of this kind, as we have already stated, were the declarations in which he pronounced himself, the Messiah, the light of the world, and the judge of all. But Christ was in a state of perfect sanity and was satisfied that these things were true. It is evident, therefore, that they were true, and that all his other declarations were true also. Being the Messiah, the light of the world, the greatest of all the prophets, and the future judge of all, he could neither deceive, nor be deceived. Hence also arises a proof of the truth of all the speeches and writings of the apostles, to whom Christ promised "the spirit of truth" to "guide" them "into all truth."*

III. Moreover, by voluntarily offering himself to the death appointed by God, Christ has set us an illustrious example, both of eminent obedience to God, and of love to men. For the death to which he freely submitted, was the most painful in itself, and was accompanied with such extreme sorrows and agonies of mind,† that, notwithstanding the infinite dignity of his person, and the spotless innocence of his life, he appeared to be almost deserted by his Divine Father; losing the accustomed sense of his love, and deprived of his wonted succour and consolation.‡ Yet in all these sufferings Christ retained his hope of the glory that was before him,§ and endured those extreme agonies, both of body and of mind, in such a manner, and for the sake of men overwhelmed with vices and sins, that he kindled with no resentment even against his murderers, and retorted none of the reproaches of those who reviled

* John xvi. 13. † Matt. xxvi. 38, 39. Mark xiv. 33, 34. Luke xxii. 44.
‡ Matt. xxvii. 46. § Heb. xii. 2.

him;* but, what may well excite admiration, even prayed that forgiveness of the heinous crime perpetrated against him might be granted to the perpetrators of it, and that in the midst of his agonies.† This was an example of obedience to God, of love to men, of hope in the promised glory, of moderation and patience, such as had never been exhibited before, and will never be exhibited again.

Nor must it be forgotten that the amazing love of Christ towards us, which discovered itself in his voluntary submission to the most agonizing death for our sakes, has a very strong and evident tendency to kindle a reciprocal love towards Christ in our hearts, and to produce its manifestation in all our lives. Hence this language of St. Paul:‡ "The love "of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, "that if one died for all then were all dead: and that "he died for all, that they which live should not "henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him "which died for them, and rose again."

IV. Lastly, the signal obedience which Christ rendered by his voluntary oblation of himself to death, obtained for him, in the capacity of Mediator, in the first place, authority over angels and men,§ and in the next place, such favour with God, that immediately before his death he effectually commended his disciples to him, and was able to intercede with him for all his people in every age. The first belongs not to this subject. The second is suggested by Christ himself; who, when praying for his apostles, mentions this very circumstance as that which would avail most with his Father, that "for their sakes" he "sanctified" himself, that is, as I have just before

* I Pet. ii. 23. † Luke xxiii. 34. ‡ II Cor. v. 14, 15. § Philip. ii. 9---11.

shown, voluntarily offered himself to die. "Sanctify "them," he says,* "through thy truth: thy word is "is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, "even so have I also sent them into the world. And "for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also "might be sanctified through the truth." Christ's design in this prayer was to obtain for his apostles those gifts of the Holy Spirit, by which they would be fully qualified for the apostolic office: for this idea is included in these words; "Sanctify them through "thy truth." To obtain what he had thus asked, he first pleaded with God the weight of the apostolic office, suggesting that no man would discharge it rightly without peculiar energies of the Holy Spirit. This is implied in these words: "As thou hast sent "me into the world, even so have I also sent them "into the world." Then he mentions his voluntary oblation of himself to death, as a circumstance capable of giving his prayers the greatest efficacy with God. For he immediately adds: "And for their "sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be "sanctified through the truth:" language which, being evidently used by Christ as an argument that his prayer should be granted, must be considered as conveying the following sentiment. 'If it gains me any 'favour in thy sight, O my Father, that in obedience 'to thy will I offer myself to the death which is 'just at hand, let thy favour towards me prevail 'with thee to impart to my apostles those gifts of the 'Holy Spirit, which will fit them in all respects for 'so important an office.' It was manifestly, therefore, in reliance on that favour with God which he obtained by his voluntary oblation of himself to death,

* John xvii. 17—19.

that Christ commended his apostles to him, and obtained for them that strength, and those aids of divine inspiration, with which it is evident they were afterwards furnished.

Nor is it to be doubted that the same obedience which was so available for the apostles, obtained for others also those aids of the Holy Spirit, by which, unless they are wanting to themselves, they may attain everlasting life. For it was not only for the apostles, but also for others, that Christ surrendered himself to death; and that surrender of himself to death was "an offering and a sacrifice to God of" such "a "sweet smelling savour,"* and so commended Christ himself to God, that Christ could effectually commend his people to him. Besides, those very gifts of the Holy Spirit, conferred on the apostles, were given to them, not only for their own salvation, but also for ours. Wherefore it is evident that in the prayer to which we have just adverted, Christ pleaded with God the merit of his obedience, not only for the sake of the apostles, but likewise for ours: and as it is certain that the Son of God, in his prayers to his Father, would never mention any plea that would not be available and effectual with him, it follows that this obedience, or voluntary oblation to death, the merit of which he pleaded with his Father on our behalf, really procured favour with God, not only for Christ himself, but also for us, notwithstanding the Socinians are of a contrary opinion.

* Ephes. v. 2.

CHAPTER V.

The Death of Christ. Passages of Scripture which represent his Death as designed to be a vicarious punishment.

FROM the obedience by which Christ freely offered himself to a bloody death, we proceed to his death itself. Now the end or design attributed to Christ's death in the scriptures, is threefold:—one, common to the death of martyrs, by which, as we have already observed, the gospel was confirmed, and we are furnished with the most perfect example of the noblest virtues:—another, belonging to the death of a testator, by which the New Testament was fully established, and access to the promised rewards laid open to the heirs of heaven; just as the death of every testator establishes his testament, and invests the heir with a right of immediate entrance on the inheritance bequeathed to him:*—the last end or design of the death of Christ was similar to that of the piacular victims commanded by the law of Moses. His death atones for our sins. For when God, notwithstanding all our demerits, determined on the one hand, to establish some way of salvation as the fruit of his infinite clemency and mercy, and on the other, not to pass over such heinous transgressions without a signal demonstration of his holiness and justice and infinite hatred of sin, he resolved that his Son, the object of his peculiar love, should become the piacular victim for our sins, and by his vicarious punishment should procure their remission. But this effect of the death of Christ having been discussed in a

* Heb. ix. 15—17.

learned and copious manner by many other writers, we shall only touch on those things which appear to have a particular bearing on the point under our immediate consideration.

II. Of this description, in the first place, is the following passage of Isaiah, in his prophecy respecting the Messiah:* "he shall divide the spoil with "the strong: because he hath poured out his soul "unto death: and he was numbered with the trans-"gressors; and he bare the sin of many." These words, "he bare the sin of many," are to be understood in a sense correspondent to the character of him who "was numbered with the transgressors," that is, was treated as a guilty person.† Now when any person who is treated as guilty, is said "to bear "sin," who can understand the phrase, *to bear sin*, as importing any other than *to suffer punishment?* For no two things can have a greater connection or agreement with each other than suffering punishment, and being treated as guilty; but all this agreement, and connection will be destroyed, if it be conceded to the followers of Socinus that the phrase *to bear sin*, in the passage just cited from the pro-

* Isaiah liii. 12.

† TR.—On the imputation of guilt to Christ, I take the liberty of transcribing a judicious remark, which I apprehend fully expresses the sense in which the statements of the author on this subject are to be understood. 'We commonly use *guilt* both in the sense of LEGAL ANSWERABLENESS '(*reatus*), and of *blameworthiness* (*culpa*). It is only in the former sense, 'and by no means in the latter, that the word is here used. In divinity, as 'well as in other sciences, it is necessary to use some terms with a technical 'definiteness of signification, much more restrained than the ordinary ac-'ceptation of the same words. If scepticism or rashness should raise a cavil, 'we can only reply, that the cavil is unreasonable. No man ridicules 'mathematical terms, because, in many instances, they are the words of 'common life employed in a very restricted signification.' DR. J. P. SMITH *On the Sacrifice of Christ*. Note, p. 72, 73.

phet, has no other meaning than to bear it away and abolish it.

It will not be a correct answer to these observations, to plead that Christ was treated as a guilty person by the Jews, but not by God: for by whose counsel and will he is said "to have borne the sin of "many," by the same counsel and will also he was treated as guilty. But it was by the counsel and will of God that "he bore the sin of many;" by his will therefore was he treated as guilty, and for this reason it is that God is said to have "*made the* "*iniquities of us all to meet upon him,*"* and to have "*made him who knew no sin to be sin for us.*†"

It should further be remarked, that when the prophet declares the Messiah to have *borne sin*, his design in this expression, as the whole context shews, is to represent him as very much burdened and oppressed by our sins: but the phrase has no such force according to the interpretation of Socinus. To say that Christ *bare away the sin of many*, unless he bare it away by sustaining the punishment of it, conveys no idea of his sufferings, much less aggravates or amplifies them. God himself is sometimes said *to bear away sin*,‡ yet in bearing it away he suffers no pain.

* Isaiah liii. 6. † I Corinth. v. 21.

‡ Exod. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 18. נשא עון rendered in our version *forgiving iniquity*.

TR.—It may well be questioned whether the sense of *bearing away* can justly be attributed to the word נשא in these texts. I beg the reader's attention to the following judicious criticism of Dr. Magee. 'That the 'signification of *forgiveness*, which evidently is not the radical meaning 'of the word has been derived from the more general one of *bearing away*, 'seems to have no just foundation: *bearing away*, necessarily implying 'something of a burden to be carried, it seems difficult to reconcile such 'a phrase with the notion of that Being, to whom this act of forgiveness is

III. The same prophet also says—"The Lord "hath made the iniquities of us all to meet on him," that is, on Christ. The sentiment conveyed in these words is, that "the Lord hath laid on him the "iniquity of us all," that is, hath inflicted on him a vicarious punishment on account of our sins. The interpretation which Crellius gives of this clause, 'that God by Christ did meet with the iniquity of us 'all,' is inconsistent with the meaning and construction of the original.* Such a licence of interpretation, as Crellius here assumes, would deprive us of all certainty respecting the meaning of any part of the scripture. Besides, the words just quoted, that "the "Lord hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on "him," in conformity with the whole context, represent "the iniquity of us all" as a burden upon Christ. This is not at all suggested by the interpretation of Crellius, but is fully implied in ours, as it is in all the best versions of the passage. The Septuagint renders it; *The Lord hath delivered him up to our sins.* The Vulgate; *The Lord hath placed on him the iniquity of us all.* The Arabic; *The Lord hath delivered him to our sins.* The Syriac; *The Lord hath caused that our sins should meet on him.* The Interlineary version; *The Lord hath made the iniquity*

'attributed.—May not the word have passed to this acceptation, through 'its primary sense of *bearing;* namely, *suffering* through patience, *en-* 'during, or *bearing* WITH?—The generic signification of the word, *when* 'applied to sins, seems to be that of *bearing, suffering, enduring:* and 'then on the part of the sinner, it implies, *bearing the burden,* or penal 'consequences of transgression: and on the part of him against whom the 'offence has been committed, *bearing with,* and patiently enduring it.' *Discourses and Dissertations,* vol. i. p. 439, 440.

* The verb הפגיע being in *Hiphil* clearly signifies not *he met,* but *he caused to meet;* and the particle את almost always precedes the accusative case, rarely the dative.

of us all to meet upon him. Castellio; *Jehovah hath thrown upon him the crime of us all.* All these versions imply that Christ was loaded with our sins as with a heavy burden, and sustained a vicarious punishment.

IV. This doctrine is inculcated in some other expressions of the prophet a little before the passage just quoted. "But he was wounded for our trans-"gressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." For it is beyond all doubt, that these phrases convey the same ideas as those which we have already adduced; so that *to be wounded for our transgressions* imports the same as to *suffer vicarious punishment for us:* indeed the phrase, *he was wounded for our transgressions*, is in itself so significant of vicarious punishment, that there is no other by which it could be more clearly denoted, or more properly expressed. And it seems not irrelevant to remark by the way, that there can be no doubt of the correctness of the same interpretation of a very similar passage of the apostle, who declares Christ to have been "delivered for our "offences."*

V. What light does the nature of the subject itself throw upon the whole of the prophecy before us, and all the expressions of the prophet that we have just noticed? In this same chapter he says, that the "soul" or life† of the Messiah "shall be made an "offering for sin."‡ And consequently, in saying that "he was wounded for our transgressions;" that "the Lord hath made the iniquity of us all to meet on "him;" and that "he bare the sin of many;" he exhibits him to universal observation as a piacular victim. For as the proper end and design of every

* Rom. iv. 25. † The original word is נפש ‡ אשם *a piacular victim.*

such victim is to suffer vicarious punishment in order to procure pardon for the guilty, there is sufficient reason for considering the same end and design as attributed to the death of Christ by the prophet, throughout this prophecy, and particularly in all the passages which we have cited. This is the obvious import both of the language employed, and of the fact foretold.

VI. By the law given to the Jews it was appointed, that the greater sins should be expiated by the blood of each guilty individual, but the smaller offences by the blood of a piacular victim, as we have shown at large in the first Dissertation. The punishment, therefore, which for the greater sins was inflicted on the sinner himself, appears in the case of smaller offences to have been transferred to the victim. This is maintained both by the Christian fathers, and by all the Jewish rabbies with one consent. And so, as the scriptures teach,* *atonement was made for the soul or life of the man by the blood or life of the victim,* the latter being substituted in the place of the former. This is so very evident, that Brennius himself on this passage has found it necessary to desert Socinus, whom he follows so closely on most others. What is his interpretation of these words of Christ?† "For this is my blood of the new covenant, which is "shed for many for the remission of sins." 'Christ, 'he says, proceeds from a comparison of the cove-'nants to a similitude of the piacular victims, in 'which the blood or life of the animal was offered as 'a substitute for the soul or life of the man. God 'says, I have given it (the blood of animals) to you 'upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls:

* Levit. xvii. 11. † Matt. xxvi. 28.

'for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the 'soul.' Such is the language extorted from Brennius by the force of truth.

So strong is the evidence of a substitution of animals for man in the piacular victims, that Crellius himself acknowledges* 'sacrifice to have been ac-'cepted by a most gracious God instead of punish-'ment.' But he maintains† that in the piacular sacrifices expiation for sin was made, not by the slaughter of the victim, but by those things which followed the death, especially the sprinkling of the blood. What is this but seeking a subterfuge for error without finding it? For to sprinkle the blood of a slaughtered victim, either on the altar, or towards the temple or mercy-seat, was no other than a symbolical presentation to God of the life of the animal, of which the blood was considered as the vehicle: so that the slaughter of the animal, or the shed blood, was the piacular ransom, but the solemn sprinkling of the blood was the sacrificial payment of that ransom. Let it be admitted, therefore, as Crellius contends, that expiation was made by the sprinkling of the blood; yet what inference can be drawn from it, but that the blood or life of the animal was presented to God as a ransom for the life of the person who offered it? Wherefore the observation of Crellius on atonement for sin being made by the sprinkling of the blood, is so far from invalidating our doctrine, that it furnishes a strong confirmation of it. For, as the sprinkling of the blood, either on the altar, or towards the temple or mercy-seat, was a peculiar part of divine worship to be performed by the priests only; and as the design of all divine worship, whe-

* Ad Heb. ix. 14. † Contra Grot. c. x. p. 87.

ther natural or instituted, is to implore or to commemorate the favour of God; the solemn sprinkling of the blood in piacular sacrifices was intended as the means of obtaining from God the pardon of sin previously committed, and had the nature and force of an intercession for forgiveness, implying the following ideas: 'I pray thee, O Lord, be merciful to this supplicant sinner, for whose purification I now sprinkle 'this blood on thy altar, and let the streaming life of 'this victim avail with thee, that thou mayest be 'pleased to save the life of the sinner for whom it has 'been shed.'

But the Hebrews were commanded to offer one kind of piacular victim, in which the solemn sprinkling of blood was never practised. This was the heifer which the law directed to be slain for murder committed in a field by a person unknown; for which atonement was made by the death of the victim, without the ritual aspersion of the blood upon the altar.* For as the crime of murder brought some degree of stain or guilt on the whole city, it being the duty of every city to keep the fields around it safe from robberies and murders; and as the stain of it remained on the city itself, till it was expiated by the death of the murderer, provided he were discovered and taken; the sacrifice of the heifer, when the murderer was not discovered, had the same effect as the death of the murderer himself in case of his detection. By the death of the murderer himself, the guilt of the murder was removed from the city to the individual who had committed it. Hence that solemn deprecation in use among the Jews whenever a criminal was about to be executed: 'Let his

* Deut. xxi. 1—9.

'death be an expiation for himself and for all Israel.' When the murderer was not discovered, the heifer was to be slain, and the sacrifice was to be accompanied by a profession of innocence, and a deprecation of punishment. The former, which belonged to the inhabitants of the city nearest to the place where the murder had been committed, was expressed in these words: "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither "have our eyes seen it." The other, which, according to the Jews,* was to be pronounced by the priests, who were required to attend on the occasion, was as follows: "Be merciful, O Lord, unto thy people "Israel whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not inno-"cent blood unto thy people of Israel's charge." After which it is immediately added, "And the blood shall "be forgiven them."

Since in this case, therefore, atonement was made by the slaughter of the heifer without any sprinkling of the shed blood, and the city was purified by this sacrifice, it proves what we have affirmed, that expiation is not to be attributed to the sprinkling of the blood in such a manner as though there could never be any atonement without that ceremony; but that the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar was evidently designed for a public demonstration that the life of the slaughtered victim was presented to God as a ransom; and that the ceremony of sprinkling the blood was one of the sacred rites peculiar to the sanctuary. And hence this rite was practised only in the instances of those victims, which were immolated, either in the sanctuary itself as in the immediate presence of God, or within sight of the sanctuary. This was the case with the red heifer, whose blood, the scriptures state,†

* Targ. Onkel. in loc. † Num. xix. 4.

was to be sprinkled by the finger of the priest seven times before or towards the sanctuary.

VII. We must now revert to another point which we have before treated more at large;* namely, that all the piacular victims whose carcasses were burned without the camp, and which in a more eminent degree than any others prefigured Christ as a piacular victim, were so contaminated with the sins of the whole congregation symbolically transferred to them, that they were required to be carried forth without the camp as polluted things; and those who carried them forth were not permitted to return to the camp, without having first been purified with water.

And it is a circumstance of divine arrangement not to be passed over, that the more clearly any victim prefigured Christ as a victim, it exhibited the clearer representation of the sins of the offerer being transferred to it. This served to indicate that the punishment of our sins was inflicted upon Christ, and that he expiated our sins by his blood, in the same manner in which among the Jews the sins of the offerers were expiated by the blood of the piacular victims. If this was not the case, for what purpose have the scriptures represented Christ as a piacular victim, his blood as the blood of a piacular victim, and the atonement made by his blood, as made by the blood of a piacular victim? For what purpose, I ask, have all these representations been given, if the piacular victims of the Jews expiated sins in one way, and Christ, whom nevertheless the Jewish victims prefigured as a piacular victim, in another way; the Jewish victims by a vicarious punishment, but Christ without any such punishment?

* D. I. c. vii. § 1, 2. c. xxi. § 3.

It forms no sufficient objection, that Christ devoted and offered himself to God without the solemn rites practised in the sacrifices of the Jews, such as imposition of hands on a victim about to be slain, performed before the consecrated altar, and the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar. For it was the divine will, that those things which under the old covenant were prefigured by external rites, should under the new covenant be exhibited in their truth and simplicity, divested of all ritual shadows. Thus the sacrifice of Christ was unattended with that sacrificial pomp which accompanied the sacrifices of the Jews. Yet the things prefigured by the Jewish rites were, as the nature of the antitype required, far more fully and effectually displayed in the sacrifice of Christ than in their sacrifices. Wherefore none of those things which were prefigured by the sacrificial rites among the Jews, and least of all, the proper nature of vicarious punishment, must be abstracted from the sacrifice of Christ. This would be contrary to the perfection of his sacrifice, to the design and appointment of God himself, to the authority of scripture, and to the nature of an antitype, the efficacy of which is invariably similar, and likewise invariably superior, to that of its types.

VIII. But these points have been argued more at large in another place. Let us now return to Isaiah, whose declaration* that "Surely he hath borne our "griefs and carried our sorrows," I understand to contain the same sentiment which is conveyed in the passages already adduced, as well as the other idea mentioned by St. Matthew :† who states these words of the prophet to have been fulfilled when Christ

* Isaiah liii. 4. † Matt. viii. 17.

restored the sick to bodily health.* For Grotius on this passage correctly remarks: 'As the transactions 'of ancient events prefigured Christ, so some of the 'actions of Christ himself served to signify others. 'It cannot be doubted that the benefit of health 'restored to the body exhibited a figure of remission 'of sins, and health restored to the mind. The pro-'phecy, therefore, was twice fulfilled; first, when 'Christ laboured till evening, employing himself in 'healing the maladies of others, as Matthew here 'shews: and afterwards, when by enduring the pu-'nishment of the cross he obtained remission of sins 'for us.'

And, indeed, unless the prophet had contemplated the Messiah's death, when he said, "Surely he hath "borne our griefs and carried our sorrows," there could have been no reason for his immediately adding, "Yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, "and afflicted:" that is, smitten on account of his own sins; for such was the supposition of those whom the prophet here personated. For it was not because he healed bodily diseases, how diligent soever he may have been in this work, but because he suffered the punishment of the cross, and was given up to death, that he could be "esteemed smitten of God." Whoever will consider these things, I think must be convinced that the words, "Surely he hath borne

* TR.—Dr. Magee suggests that all apparent dissonance between the prophet and evangelist will be removed, if we understand חליינו and ασθενειας of bodily pains and distempers, and מכאוביו and νοσους of diseases and torments of the mind. Dr. M. has adduced many examples of the use of these words to justify these interpretations; and he accordingly refers the former clause to Christ's *removing the sicknesses* of men by miraculous cures, and the latter to his *bearing their sins* upon the cross. *Discourses and Dissertations*, vol. I. p. 419—431.

"our griefs and carried our sorrows," contain the same sentiment as the declarations which follow them. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, "he was bruised for our iniquities. The Lord hath "laid on him the iniquity of us all. When he shall "make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his "seed, he shall prolong his days. He bare the sin of "many." And the import of all these declarations, I trust, has been satisfactorily ascertained.

IX. But whatever was intended in these passages of Isaiah, is also intended by St. Peter, when, in allusion to the language of the prophet, he says of Jesus Christ:* "Who his own self bare our sins in "his own body on the tree." If this passage be rendered, according to Crellius,† *carried our sins up to the tree*, it is equally in favour of our doctrine. For those evils which Christ *bore upon the tree*, or, *carried up to the tree*, were *in his body, in which* he is said to have borne them upon the tree, or to have carried them up to the tree. The evils which were in his body were not his own vices or sins properly so called, but were the punishments of our sins, which throughout the scriptures are commonly designated as *sins*. And these punishments could in no sense be in the body of Christ, without being endured by him. But if Christ endured in his body the punishment of our sins, he clearly suffered a vicarious punishment. And forasmuch as he voluntarily took upon himself the punishments appointed and proposed to him for our sins, it was for this end, as is expressed in the next clause; "that we being dead to sins, should live "unto righteousness," and devote all our efforts to the pursuit of it. For nothing is more calculated to

* I Peter ii. 24. † Contra Grot. c. i. p. 34.

excite and inflame our love to Christ than that infinite love of Christ to us, which is manifested in his voluntary submission to a most cruel death on our account: and true love to Christ is the most powerful motive to evangelical obedience. Hence that declaration of St. Paul:* "For the love of Christ constraineth us; "because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then "were all dead: and that he died for all, that they "which live should not henceforth live unto them-"selves, but unto him that died for them, and rose "again."

X. But it is urged, that any one may well be said *to bear sins*, 'who on the account of sins sus-'tains a heavy burden of calamities, tortures, and 'death, although there be no real punishment or 'vengeance in the case.' This is the language of Crellius,† but evidently without reason. For when we affirm that the phrase, *to bear sins*, signifies some punishment, we rely not upon the mere force of the phrase itself, but form our opinion on a consideration of the passages in which it is found, and the nature of the subject. The scope of the passages already quoted, in which this phrase occurs, fixes its meaning, as we have already shown, to vicarious punishment; and the subject itself rejects every other interpretation of it. In these passages Christ is introduced as a piacular victim. So Isaiah has introduced him in express terms, and he is followed by St. Peter. The proper nature and design of a piacular victim is exhibited, as we have elsewhere proved at large, in vicarious punishment: which, although according to the opinion of Crellius it may want the character of vindictive, not being inflicted for the demerit of

* II Cor. v. 14, 15. † Contra Grot. c. i. p. 32.

the person punished, nevertheless retains that which constitutes it vicarious punishment, as we have sufficiently explained in another place.

It only remains for us to conclude this chapter by declaring our dissent from what some have incautiously affirmed, that we were punished in Christ; which ought by no means to be admitted. For he who is punished in a friend, does himself receive some detriment and injury from the evils inflicted on that friend. In this way parents are punished in their children; whose calamities are attended with loss, sorrow, or disgrace, which may be considered as a punishment, to the parents themselves. But the contrary of all this has been the effect of those punishments which Christ endured for us. Not only have they never produced the least detriment or injury to us, but they have procured the pardon of our sins and eternal salvation. Hence it is easy to perceive, that there is a wide difference between our being punished *in* Christ, and his being punished *for* us. For to affirm that we have been punished in Christ, will be, by consequence, to maintain that we have received some injury from the sufferings of Christ: which is very far from the truth. But to affirm that Christ endured punishment for us, is to maintain, what is strictly true, that punishment was endured by him, in order that we might be delivered from punishment.

CHAPTER VI.

Passages of Scripture which represent Atonement as effected by the Death of Christ.

FROM our examination of passages in which the death of Christ is expressly described as a vicarious punishment, we now proceed to those in which he is declared to have sanctified or purified our persons, or to have expiated or purged our sins, either by himself, or by his blood or sacrifice.

To this purpose is the following language of the apostle to the Hebrews.* "We have an altar, "whereof they have no right to eat which serve the "tabernacle. For the bodies of those beasts, whose "blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high "priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Where-"fore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people "with his own blood, suffered without the gate." *To sanctify the people,* here, signifies the same as to purify the people; and to purify the people, is to expiate the sins of the people. Since it appears therefore from this passage, and that with evidence too plain to be contradicted, that our sins were expiated by the blood or death of Christ, the only point for controversial discussion is, upon what principle, or in what manner, his death accomplished this. But this question will easily be determined, if we are disposed to follow the train of the argument. For as the apostle is here speaking of Christ as a piacular victim, and of the blood of Christ, as the blood of a piacular victim; his death must be considered as expiating sins in the same way as the death of a pia-

* Heb. xiii. 10---12.

cular victim. It was by vicarious punishment, that all piacular victims expiated the sins for which they were offered:—upon the same principle, therefore, and in the same manner, our sins were expiated by Christ.

The illustration which has been given of this passage serves also to illustrate another of the same apostle:* "When he had by himself purged our sins, "he sat down on the right hand of the majesty on "high." To which may be added the following from St. John:† "*But if we* walk in the light, as he is in "the light, we have fellowship one with another, and "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from "all sin." In these passages the same property of expiating sins, which belongs to a piacular victim, is attributed to Christ and his blood. In the latter, this is clear from the mention of cleansing effected by his blood. In the former, Christ is introduced as having purged or expiated sins *by himself*, that is, by himself as *sacrificed*. The manner in which piacular victims expiate sins is by vicarious punishment:—the same mode of expiation, therefore, is in these passages attributed to Christ.

II. We now come to those passages in which either the expiation of sins, or, what is precisely the same, the purification of the guilty, effected by the death or blood of Christ, is denominated *the redemption*‡ of them. Thus the apostle to the Hebrews:§ "And "for this cause he is the mediator of the new testa-"ment, that, by means of death, for the redemption

* Heb. i. 3. † I John i. 7.

‡ Ἀπολυτρωσις. This word, as used by the writers of the New Testament, answers to כפר in the Jewish writers, and denotes *expiation, atonement, purging by sacrifice.* § Heb. ix. 15.

"of the transgressions that were under the first "testament, they which are called might receive the "promise of eternal inheritance." *The redemption of transgressions by means of death*, is equivalent to *the expiation of sins effected by the death of Christ*, as a victim: and it was by the vicarious punishment of the slain victim, as we have already shown, that all such expiation was made.—Observe also the language of St. Paul concerning Christ in two of his epistles:* "In whom we have redemption through "his blood, the forgiveness of sins." The original word denotes not any *redemption* whatever, but such as consists in the expiation made by a piacular victim. This is evident from the mention of *blood*, and *the forgiveness of sins;* of blood, as the blood of a surety making expiation; and of forgiveness of sins, as procured by the expiation of that surety. Nor can it be doubted that the apostle, when he mentioned these two things in such close connection, had in view both the expiation by the blood of piacular victims among the Jews, and the remission of sins procured by that expiation. The apostle to the Hebrews thus mentions them both:† "And almost all things "are by the law purged with blood; and without "shedding of blood is no remission." Since St. Paul, therefore, in the passages just quoted, speaks of the blood of Christ, as of the blood of a piacular victim, there is no doubt that he attributes to the death of Christ the same kind of efficacy which belongs to the death of such a victim. And this efficacy, as we have frequently observed, is of such a nature, that by the vicarious punishment of the slain victim it procures for the sinner the pardon of his sin.

* Ephes. i. 7. Coloss. i. 14. † Heb. ix. 22.

III. The meaning here assigned to the Greek word rendered *redemption* may be confirmed by the universal acceptation of the correspondent term among the Jewish writers.* Baal Aruch speaks the sense of them all:† 'In every place where any one says, Let 'me be his expiation, it is the same as if he had said, 'Let me be substituted in his place, that I may bear 'his iniquities: which is equivalent to saying, I, in 'order that he may obtain pardon, do take his sins 'upon myself.' Hence we gain some illustration of the passages just quoted from St. Paul. For though Christ, indeed, was not substituted in our place, in such a manner as to bear the same kind of punishments from which we are delivered, yet the punishment which he suffered does as truly expiate our sins and procure the pardon of them, as if they had been precisely of the same kind that we were ourselves liable to undergo. This is the very idea conveyed by the apostle, when he says, that "in Christ we have re-"demption through his blood, the forgiveness of "sins;" and he seems to suggest the same, when he speaks of "them that believe being justified freely by "his" (that is, God's) "grace, through the redemption "that is in Christ Jesus."‡

IV. We next advert to the passages of scripture in which Christ is said to be a *ransom*:§ a term which the Jewish writers are accustomed to apply to every piacular victim; which they describe as the 'substi-'tute and ransom of the sinner,' affirming the life of the animal to be 'sacrificed instead of his life.'‖

* See note on § 2. † See Dis. I. c. xxii. § 9. ‡ Rom. iii. 22. 24.

§ Λυτρον and Αντιλυτρον. These words answer to the word כפר in the Jewish writings.

‖ See quotations from several rabbies, Dis. I. c. xxii. § 10.

Christ declares, concerning himself;* "The son of "man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister "and to give his life a ransom for many." No person doubts (not even Brennius himself) that Christ in these words declared the very same that had been predicted by Isaiah, when he said that the soul of the Messiah would be made a piacular victim, "an "offering for sin;"† which is also confirmed by the fact which I have stated, that the Jews are accustomed to call every piacular victim a *ransom*, and to speak of the life of the victim as sacrificed instead of the life of the sinner himself. Since Christ, therefore, in the words just quoted, has spoken of his death, or his "life given for many," as of the life of a piacular victim given for sinners, he ought to be considered as having by such language attributed to his death the same kind of efficacy which belongs to a piacular victim. But that efficacy, as we have often stated, is displayed in remission of sins obtained by vicarious punishment.—St. Paul says:‡ "There is one God and one "Mediator between God and men, the man Christ "Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all." As far as relates to the subject now under discussion, these words contain the same sentiment as the words of Christ just quoted, in which he spoke of himself as about "to give his life a ransom for many;" and they must, therefore, be considered as attributing to his death the same efficacy that is attributed to it by Christ himself: a proposition too self evident to admit of any controversy. The only difference is, that Christ, contemplating those only who would really embrace the conditions of the new covenant, said he was about "to give his life a ransom for many;" and

* Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. † אשם Isaiah liii. 10. ‡ I Tim. ii. 5, 6.

the apostle, contemplating all those to whom that covenant is proposed, says that Christ "gave him-"self a ransom for *all*.

V. Here we may cite another declaration of Christ:* "For this is my blood of the new testament "or covenant,† which is shed for many for the remis-"sion of sins:" in which he so plainly represents his blood as the blood of an expiatory sacrifice: and this is evident from many considerations. In the first place he calls his blood the "blood of the new covenant;" a phrase which implied that the sacrifice he was soon to offer, which from this and other passages appears to have been of the piacular kind, would ratify the new covenant, just as other covenants had formerly been ratified by the blood of victims. In the next place, he declares that his blood was "shed "for many for the remission of sins;" which could only be affirmed of the blood of a piacular victim. Further; this declaration of Christ which we are now explaining, evidently contains the same sentiment as the other before quoted in which he said he was about "to give his life a ransom for many," that is, as we have just before shown, as an expiatory sacrifice. For though in the passage now under consideration he has not introduced the term *ransom*, yet he has expressly mentioned the thing itself, that is, his blood, in which our ransom consists. He has also specified the object, for the sake of procuring which from God, that ransom was given; namely, "remission of sins:" so that there can be no room to doubt, that the same sentiment is conveyed in both places. Since Christ therefore, in declaring his blood to be shed for many for the remission of sins, has spoken of his

* Matt. xxvi. 28. † Διαθηκης.

blood as of the blood of a piacular victim; he ought to be considered as having attributed to himself, in that character, the same design and efficacy which belongs to a piacular victim. But the design and efficacy belonging to a piacular victim is displayed in pardon of sins procured by vicarious punishment.

VI. The remarks which have been offered may explain the following passage:* "Christ hath re-"deemed us from the curse of the law, being made "a curse for us." For the same writer who in another place calls Christ *a ransom*,† that is, a piacular victim, has himself by the word *redeemed* shown the efficacy of that *ransom;* fully implying, in the passage last quoted, that all those sins for which indeed no pardon was proposed in the Mosaic covenant, are, by the life of Christ given as a ransom for us, (unless we exclude ourselves from the benefit,) expiated and remitted. Which is the same as is said by the apostle to the Hebrews, where he states that Christ died "for the redemption of transgres-"sions that were under the first covenant;"‡ a phrase by which he intended to indicate those sins, for which the Mosaic covenant promised no remission.

The objection urged by Crellius,§ that between Christ and us there was only such a commutation as there is between a price and a thing bought, but that it belongs not to a price to suffer a vicarious punishment on account of the thing purchased,—has no force at all. For when the term *price* is applied to a piacular victim, it ought to be taken in such a sense as the design of such a victim requires. Wherefore we understand the commutation between us and

* Galat. iii. 13. † I Tim. ii. 6. ‡ Heb. ix. 15.
§ Contra Grot. c. ix. p. 2.

Christ, who gave himself an expiatory sacrifice for our sins, to have been such as took place between every guilty person and his piacular victim: and this commutation was of that kind with which vicarious punishment was always connected.

VII. To the foregoing passages add the following of St. John;* "Herein is love, not that we loved "God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be "the propitiation for our sins." The original term here rendered *propitiation*,† and its cognate verbs,‡ in their native meaning, signify *placating*, *appeasing*; but they sometimes denote *expiation*, *purification*, and *pardon*.§ The word is here used by St. John to designate an atonement or propitiatory sacrifice.‖ We admit that Christ is said to be "the *propitiation*¶ for sins," and "to *make reconciliation*** "for sins," in his character of high priest now pleading our cause with God in the heavenly sanctuary. But the text now under consideration fully implies the principle we are maintaining. For it is evident that the apostle here contemplated the death of Christ as furnishing the most striking manifestation of that infinite love of God, here mentioned, who "sent "his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." It is equally clear also, that he here speaks of the death of Christ as of the death of a piacular victim. This is evident from the phrase itself, *propitiation for sins;*

* I John iv. 10. † Ιλασμος. ‡ Ιλασκομαι and εξιλασκομαι.

§ Vide Septuag. Deut. xxi. 8. I Sam. iii. 14. II Kings v. 18. Dan. ix. 24.—The son of Sirach says of God—ουδε εν πληθει θυσιων εξιλασκεται αμαρτιας, nor doth he *forgive* sins for the multitude of sacrifices. *Eccles.* xxxiv. 20.,

‖ TR.—The Septuagint translators have used the word ιλασμος, in Ezek. xliv. 27. for חטאה and in Amos viii. 14. for אשמה

¶ I John ii. 2. ιλασμος. ** Heb. ii. 17. ιλασκεσθαι.

an expression which attributes to Christ and to his death, that which is proper to such a victim, namely, the expiation of sins: and expiation of sins, whenever it was effected by a piacular victim, was effected by vicarious punishment. So that the passage just quoted from St. John contains this sentiment—that God so loved us who were his enemies, that he sent his Son to expiate our sins by a vicarious punishment.

VIII. But it is objected, that since God gave Christ to die for us, and could not be induced to this gift by the death of Christ, for it was impossible that Christ's death could be the procuring cause of his dying for us; the benevolence of God towards us, wholly irrespective of Christ's death, was so great, that he must be considered as forgiving us without any reason at all derived from that death. This objection proceeds upon the assumption, that for God to be benevolent towards us, is the same thing as to forgive our sins, and that fully and perfectly: which is very far from being true. For God shewed himself very benevolent towards the whole human race, when he sent his Son to lay down his life for them; yet he did not by that act grant to all of them the remission of their sins; unless, indeed, by this term you understand, not that full and perfect remission, of which we are now treating, and which is never bestowed upon any one who is not a subject of true faith and sincere piety,—but a less perfect remission, which obtains in all cases, in which God proceeds not to the utmost extent of justice in punishing the sins of men, and more especially whenever he bestows on a person continuing in sins any thing that tends to his salvation. This procedure exhibits a kind of preter-

mission or respite of sin, which the scripture, as some have expounded it,* calls a "remission" or "passing "over,"† and ascribes to "the forbearance of God." There are, however, several kinds of this less perfect pardon, which were procured by the death of Christ: but to set these things in a clearer light, they require to be explained a little more at large.

IX. There is, then, as we have just stated, a two-fold remission of sin: one less perfect; the other more full and perfect, which is offered to all mankind on the conditions of faith and repentance, and is actually given to all who comply with those conditions. Of the less perfect remission there are several kinds: the first was that which was displayed in God's determination, that Christ should die for the whole human race; which, though it could not possibly be procured by the death of Christ, was nevertheless a kind of pretermission or respite of our sins; for if it had been the will of God to assert his just right of inflicting condign punishment, he would not have appointed that Christ should die for us. And in this sense some persons suppose the apostle is to be understood, when he says,‡ "that God was in "Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not im-"puting their trespasses unto them;" that is, not so far imputing them as to be unwilling that Christ should die for them. But there is another less perfect remission of sins, which was exercised, when, for the sake of mankind sunk in vices and sins, God conferred upon his apostles the gifts of the Holy Spirit, by which they were enabled to discover to us the way to eternal life. But these aids of divine in-

* Vide Grot. and Hamm. in Rom. iii. 25.

† See English Version and Margin. ‡ I Cor. v. 19.

spiration, as we have already shown, were procured for them by the death of Christ; though in imparting these aids God may be considered as having contemplated, not so much the vicarious punishment which Christ endured in his death, as that perfect obedience by which he offered himself to die. And to this Grotius concludes the apostle to refer when he says;* "All have sinned, and come short of the "glory of God; being justified freely by his grace "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." 'Christ, by his obedience, principally in his death, 'and by his prayers which attended it, obtained this 'from the Father, that he should not abandon and 'harden the human race, sunk under a load of sins, 'but should give them the way of obtaining righte-'ousness by Christ. (Isai. liii. 4.) This very thing 'is called *remitting* or *forgiving sins;* (Luke xxiii. '34.) and also *redeeming:* (Luke i. 68.) that is de-'livering from the necessity of dying in sins by dis-'covering a way of escape from it.' He soon after adds, that this way was made known by the apostles, to whom, as he had before remarked, God imparted the extraordinary aids of the Holy Spirit, on account of the prayers of Christ, and for the sake of his obedience, which was chiefly displayed in his death. But there is also a third sort of less perfect remission of sin, which God grants to particular individuals, whenever, notwithstanding their demerits, he not only refrains from cutting off all opportunity for repentance, and closing up the way of salvation, but even imparts strength and assistance by which, unless they are wanting to themselves, they may attain eternal life. Such was the kind of pardon which St. Ste-

* Rom. iii. 23, 24.

phen implored for his murderers:* "Lord, lay not "this sin to their charge." Such also was the forgiveness which Christ prayed for, even during his crucifixion, on behalf of those who reviled him;† *Father, forgive them:* which was not a petition for that perfect forgiveness which is granted only to him who forsakes his sins by true repentance: but for that less perfect remission of sins which we have last described.‡ And that this species of remission was procured by the death of Christ, I think will not be doubted by any person who has attended to the observations we have already made. For there is no

* Acts vii. 60. † Luke xxiii. 34.

‡ TR.—Though I have not thought it necessary to controvert every exposition or sentiment in which I differ from the author, I cannot pass this section without expressing my opinion that it forms an exception to the general simplicity and accuracy of these Dissertations. The interpretation here given of the dying petitions of our Lord and his martyred disciple is very far fetched and unnatural; and, if true, would exceedingly lower our conceptions of the compassion and benevolence by which those petitions were dictated. That *remissium* or *forgiveness of sins*, in the scriptures, ever denotes any thing less than perfect pardon, is an assumption wholly unsupported by any proof. What is here termed the *less perfect remission*, appears to be no other than what the scripture calls the *long suffering of God.* (I *Pet.* iii. 20.) But to affirm that those who experienced this "long "suffering in the days of Noah," were favoured with the forgiveness of their sins, would be strange language indeed. Both the protomartyr, in imploring for his persecutors the non-imputation of their sin; and our Lord, in praying that his murderers might be forgiven; evidently contemplated and intended that plenary pardon, which the psalmist of Israel and the apostle of the gentiles unite in describing as true blessedness: (*Psal.* xxxii. 1, 2. *Rom.* iv. 6—8.) "Blessed is he whose transgression is for-"given;—blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity:" but surely this imports more than a mere suspension of condign punishment. Nor have we any reason to suspect that these supplications were offered in vain. Among the aiders and abettors of the martyrdom of Stephen, was Saul of Tarsus, whose subsequent conversion may be justly regarded as a signal answer to this "fervent prayer" of the expiring saint: and the records of the day of pentecost attest the conversion and forgiveness of many who were concerned in crucifying the Son of God, and were, consequently, the immediate objects of his dying intercession.

reason to conclude, that his death procured for the apostles those gifts of the Holy Spirit which tended to promote the salvation of others as well as their own, and that it had no share in procuring those other gifts by which any individual has experienced himself to be divinely assisted to repent and reform his life. Hence we conclude, that, whatever may have been the grace or benevolence of God towards men, irrespective of the death of Christ; he is nevertheless so far from granting a full and perfect remission of sins without any consideration of his death, that he does not grant some species even of the less perfect remission, but clearly on account of his death.

X. But since Christ received his life and blood from God, it will be asked, what could that satisfaction be which was procured by the oblation of his life and blood to God, but a kind of ludicrous transaction, in which God gave to himself, and satisfied himself, from that which was his own? But persons who argue in this manner deceive themselves with their own subtleties. For we do not maintain that the mere life or blood of Christ made satisfaction to God, but his life or blood shed with the most agonizing sufferings and in the most perfect obedience to God: that obedience and those sufferings were Christ's own, and with them he made satisfaction to God.* It may also be observed, that they who will

* TR.—The satisfaction made by the sacrifice of Christ is here attributed to the divine appointment, and the extreme agonies which he suffered. But if it derived all its efficacy from these two considerations, human guilt might have been expiated by the sacrifice of some being infinitely inferior to the Incarnate Word. We know no analogies in the divine administration to induce a supposition that God ever employs agents or instruments above what are called for by the occasion to which they are applied. His mode of procedure is rather to accomplish great effects by means which

suffer the punishment of all their own sins in hell, will suffer that punishment in those bodies and souls which God himself has given them; yet that there will not on this accocount be any thing ludicrous in their torments. But what we have said may suffice on this point.

XI. We proceed to those passages in which Christ is said to have *died*, to have been *given*, or to have *suffered for our sins*. "*Christ died for our sins.*" "*Christ gave himself for our sins, that he might* "*deliver us from this present evil world.*" "*Christ* "*hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,* "*that he might bring us to God.*"* These declarations I think justify the conclusion, that our sins constituted what is termed the *impulsive*, or procuring cause of Christ's death, and that the expiation of those sins was the *final* cause, or end of it. These two causes are so closely connected, that wherever one is expressed the other is always implied. There

appear to us feeble and inadequate. Without indulging wild speculations on what God could have done in any imaginable cases, we may venture to infer the peculiar fitness and moral necessity of the agency and instrumentality adopted by him under what the scriptures reveal to be the actual constitution of the moral universe. And that in the sacrifice which should avert the punishment of sin, maintain the honour of the divine government, and reconcile men to their offended Maker, something more was requisite than divine appointment, and intenseness of suffering, is fairly deducible from the reasoning of the apostle to the Hebrews: (ix. 13, 14.) "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprink-"ling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; *how much* "*more* shall the blood of Christ, who *through* THE ETERNAL SPIRIT offered "himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works "to serve the living God!" This language, and the general representations and implications of the scriptures, oblige me to consider the principal value of the Saviour's sacrifice as derived from his true and proper Deity, which communicated an infinite dignity and importance to all the acts that he performed in the character of Mediator.

* I Cor. xv. 3, Gal. i. 4. I Pet. iii. 18.

appears indeed to be this difference between ὑπὲρ and περὶ, the two Greek particles rendered *for* in the passages just quoted, that the former denotes, more expressly the final cause, and tacitly the impulsive cause; the latter signifies, more expressly the impulsive cause, and tacitly the final cause: but both agree in this, that each of them shews our sins to have been the impelling or procuring cause of Christ's death, and their expiation the final cause or end of it. And I am the rather induced to form this conclusion, because the very same expressions are commonly used in reference to piacular sacrifices,* and, whenever they are so employed, are invariably significant of the expiation of sin. But in what manner or upon what principle our sins were expiated by Christ, as a piacular sacrifice, the very principle of such a sacrifice shows: for it was by vicarious punishment, that every piacular victim expiated the sin for which it was offered.

Nor is it any objection to this reasoning, that Christ is said to have "given himself for our sins, that he "might deliver us from this present evil world."† For when Christ expiated our sins by his death, he designed also that we should by that expiation be delivered and purified from the vices of the present world: so that this passage, as well as another just cited from St. Peter, proposes two ends of the death of Christ: of these, the immediate one is the expiation of our sins; the remote one is the end of this expiation itself which Christ's death accomplished. The former is contained in these words; "Christ "gave himself for our sins;" the latter in those which follow; "that he might deliver us from this

* Heb. i. 5. vii. 27. x. 18. 26. xiii. 11. † Galat. i. 4.

"present evil world," to which deliverance the expiation effected by Christ's voluntary death most powerfully contributes. Hence arises the strongest hope of obtaining the pardon of our sins, if we are disposed to yield obedience to Christ; and also, what may stimulate us to that obedience, the highest love both towards Christ and towards the Father who gave him.* Hence it follows, that the two ends of our Lord's death, which we have just mentioned, are so far from being at variance, or inconsistent with each other, that there is the greatest harmony between them: whereas the contrary would be the case, if these words, "Christ died for our sins," be understood to import, that Christ died to abolish our sins. For as the clause immediately following, "that he "might deliver us from this present evil world," contains this very sentiment, it will be found on due consideration, that the same must be attributed to both clauses: and with this interpretation the meaning of the apostle will be—Christ died to abolish our sins, and that in order that he might abolish our sins:—a proposition which is equally frivolous and absurd.

Nor can it with any propriety be maintained that the clause, *Christ died for our sins,* is merely a general declaration, that Christ died in order to do something relating to our sins, but that what that was is specified in the next clause, *that he might deliver us from this present evil world.* This interpretation, we say, cannot with propriety be maintained; for if this were the true meaning, the words *for our sins* would be manifestly redundant, and it might have been better stated, that *Christ died that he might deliver us from this present evil world,* without the words

* II Cor. v. 14, 15. John xiv. 23. I John v. 3. Col. i. 21, 22.

for our sins being introduced. On this supposition also the declaration of the apostle in another place,* "that Christ died for our sins," without any explanation being added, would be obscure and unsatisfactory; as it would convey no other idea than that Christ died in order to do something pertaining to our sins. But all these absurdities will be avoided if the declaration *that Christ died for our sins* be understood to import, that he died to atone for our sins.

XII. It remains for us to explain those phrases in which Christ is said to have died "for us, for all, "for the ungodly," and the like. It is evident indeed, and ought to be unreservedly admitted, that the expressions in themselves may signify the whole efficacy of the death of Christ, as well that by which our sins are destroyed, as that by which they are expiated. Hence, wherever they occur, they ought to be understood as the scope of each particular passage may require; and whenever the scope of a passage will admit, it should be considered as attributing to the death of Christ that twofold efficacy of which we have spoken. This is the case with that passage of the apostle in his epistle to the Romans:† "Destroy "not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." For who can doubt that all the energy of the death of Christ which relates to his salvation is here intended? but that efficacy is displayed in destroying his sins as well as in atoning for them. But when the apostle Peter says,‡ "Christ suffered for us, leaving "us an example," he contemplates not so much the atoning efficacy, as that patient submission to grievous injuries which was so eminently conspicuous in

* I Corinth. xv. 3. † Rom. xiv. 15. ‡ I Peter ii. 21.

the death of Christ, and which he proposes to our imitation. When St. Paul says,* that Christ "gave "himself a ransom for all," he attributes to the Saviour's death that efficacy which, as we have already shown, belonged to it as a piacular sacrifice. The same sentiment is conveyed also by Christ himself when he declares his blood to be "shed for many for "the remission of sins."† He who fully understands these texts, will be at no loss to judge of others that are similar, on a due consideration of the scope of each particular passage.

XIII. After these observations it seems proper to remark, that it has been justly concluded by the Jews, that the piacular victims commanded by the law of Moses, were substituted in the place of transgressors, so that they suffered the same kind of punishment, namely death, from which the transgressors themselves were delivered. This indeed cannot be truly and properly affirmed concerning Jesus Christ, as he did not endure those eternal punishments, and that despair of salvation, from which we are delivered: yet nevertheless, the sufferings sustained by our Lord on account of our sins were designed as a vicarious punishment, and obtained the pardon of our sins on condition of our being disposed to yield obedience to God. For in vicarious punishment, if the person who has a right to inflict punishment is satisfied, it is of no importance whether it be of the same kind as that from which the criminal is delivered, or of any other.

But how it is that the death of Christ does not deliver us from eternal death, unless we obey the gospel, may easily be understood from the remarks

* I Tim. ii. 6. † Matt. xxvi. 28.

we have already made respecting vicarious punishment. For, as we have stated before, the law which pronounces every offender deserving of punishment, denounces death, not upon Christ, but upon us. Hence it is that his death cannot of itself supersede that sentence; can supersede it no further, or otherwise, than according to the will of God. Now the will of God is that the death of Christ shall avail for pardon of sins and eternal life only to him who possesses true faith and sincere piety. And here lies the difference between vicarious punishment and that which is inflicted upon a transgressor in his own person: the punishment of the transgressor, provided it be equal to his guilt, which is determined by the penalty of the law, does of itself satisfy that penalty and discharge from any further obligation to punishment: but this is not effected by vicarious punishment, except through the favour of him who has the right to punish. Hence also it may be concluded, that the death of Christ, notwithstanding it was designed as a vicarious punishment, was in no respect opposed to the grace of God. For it was owing to his grace, that Christ died for us, and that his death is available to procure for us remission of sins and eternal life. Nor, in this transaction, did Christ receive any injury from God, or God from Christ. For Christ laid down his life for us voluntarily, so that no injustice was done by the Father to the Son; and he had a right to lay it down, so that no injustice was committed by the Son against the Father.

Nor will those who shall finally bear the punishments of their sins, have any reason to think themselves unjustly treated, or to complain that their sins are punished twice, first in Christ, and again in their

own persons. For punishment is justly inflicted on every one who is not discharged from the obligation to punishment: and the obligation to punishment remains* on every adult person who does not comply with the conditions of the new covenant, which are faith and obedience. Nor is the vicarious punishment exhibited in the death of Christ of such a nature, as, either of itself, or by the design of the Father or the Son, to discharge from the penalty of the law without a compliance with those conditions. For, being vicarious, it has not altogether the same operation as the punishment of a transgressor in his own person; but its efficacy is suspended on this condition which God has chosen as satisfactory to himself, and demonstrative of his perfect holiness and abhorrence of our sins. Though the operation of such a punishment, therefore, is in some respects different from the personal punishment of a transgressor, it tends nevertheless to the same end,—the production and establishment of reverence for the divine laws.

* John iii. 18.

CHAPTER VII.

The Oblation by which Christ presented himself to God in Heaven, as a Piacular Victim previously slain for our Sins. Arguments to show that Christ did this in order to commend to God both Us and our Services in general, and our Prayers in particular. The true Nature of his Intercession.

HAVING treated of the death of Christ as that of a piacular victim, we must now proceed to the oblation which followed his death. For it is beyond all doubt that Jesus Christ, our immortal high priest, on his entrance into the celestial sanctuary, did in heaven itself, present himself to God as an expiatory victim previously slain for our sins. This proposition indeed must be sufficiently evident on its being stated, unless any one is determined to deny that our Lord either died for our sins as a piacular victim, or presented himself in that character before the throne of the Divine Majesty: neither of which can be denied without extreme violence to the scriptures. This truth is also evinced by the clearest types of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice: for the blood of those victims, which above all others typified Christ in that character, was offered in the most holy place, which was a figure of the highest heaven. The same is taught by the apostle, who mentions the oblation of Christ, and without adverting to his death, or resurrection, or ascension to heaven, as intermediate events, passes to his session at the right hand of God.* Hence it is concluded, that this session immediately followed *that* oblation of which he there speaks. But there is

* Heb. x. 12.

the less necessity for enlarging on this point, because the oblation of Christ to God in heaven as a piacular victim previously slain for our sins is not only admitted, but most strenuously contended for, by all the followers of Socinus.

II. Let us inquire, therefore, with what intention our Lord offered himself to his Father in heaven: a question belonging to our present subject, and one upon which I conceive the sentiments entertained by the disciples of Socinus to be exceedingly erroneous. For it admits of no reasonable doubt, though they are unanimous in denying it, that our Lord did this with the express intention of commending to God, both us and our services in general, and our prayers in particular. Both these things were typified by the high priest of the Jews on every annual day of expiation: the former, when in order to commend his people to God, he sprinkled the blood of the piacular victims in that inner sanctuary which was a figure of heaven itself: the other, when in the same place he burned the sacred incense, as a symbol of the prayers of his people, and by that rite symbolically presented those prayers to God. In some points, however, those types evidently differed from the antitypes. First, the Jewish high priest carried not the bodies of the victims, but only their blood or life, into the innermost sanctuary of the temple; whereas Christ, our high priest, carried both the soul and body of the victim slain for us, into heaven of which that sanctuary was an emblem. Secondly, the Jewish high priest, by burning the sacred incense before the Lord, presented to him the prayers of the people, only, as we have observed, in a symbolical sense: whereas Christ, without the intervention of any symbols, now com-

mends our prayers to God in heaven; and his plea for God's acceptance of those prayers is derived from his own death.

III. Though these things are so obvious that they seem to carry their own evidence with them, yet respecting that oblation by which Christ presented himself to God in heaven, very different sentiments are entertained by the followers of Socinus. For though they admit his entrance into heaven to be connected with the care of our salvation, yet they conclude that this care of our salvation is entirely exercised *towards us*, and that Christ as our high priest sustains no function by which he can be said to commend *to God*, either us and our services in general, or our prayers in particular. Believing those things to be done for us by Christ, we shall endeavour to establish them both, considering them first as distinct, and then as connected.

Now the first point, which is that Christ presented himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary in such a manner as constantly to commend to him both our persons and services, and with a view to render him perfectly propitious to us, is proved by the declaration that he *offered** himself to God in heaven; by the design of the sacerdotal office, of which office the oblation that followed the slaughter of the victim was always a principal function; and by the express language of the scriptures.

For in the first place, he who is said to offer any thing to God, is by this very expression declared to have business with God, and to do that which relates to God. Hence it is evident that Christ, in offering himself to God as a piacular victim previously slain

* Heb. ix. 14. x. 12.

for our sins, performed a function which related to God. But what was the object of that function may be learned from the design of such a sacrifice; which its piacular nature shows to have been, that God in consideration of it might be inclined to be propitious to us. But if Christ our high priest had entered into the heavenly sanctuary without intending to do any thing that related to God, there could have been no reason why he should have been said to have offered himself to God there. For to what purpose would he have been said to have offered, or presented himself, to him with whom he had no business?

Moreover, as the oblation which followed the slaughter of the victim was one of the principal functions of a priest; and as every priest, unless he were wanting to his duty, would offer the piacular sacrifices with a desire that God would be propitious to his people; it is concluded that Christ our high priest, who in that office displays the greatest faithfulness and benevolence towards us, offered himself to God in heaven, as a piacular victim previously slain for our sins, in order that he might constantly commend to him both our persons and services, and with a desire to render him perfectly propitious to us.

The same truth is conveyed in the following passage of the epistle to the Hebrews:* "For Christ is "not entered into the holy places made with hands, "which are the figures of the true; but into heaven "itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; "nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the "high priest entereth into the holy place every year "with blood of others." These two phrases, "to "appear in the presence of God for us" and "to

* Heb. ix. 24, 25.

"offer himself to God," signify one and the same thing, considered in two different points of view; the latter as begun, the former as continued: with the exception of this single difference, both expressions possess the same force, and convey the same sentiment. The meaning of the former phrase is self-evident. For when the apostle says that "Christ "appears in the presence of God," he attributes to Christ some office that is exercised immediately with God. For to what purpose, except to do something that has respect to God and is transacted immediately with him, is it said that he "appears in the presence "of God?" But when he is said "to appear in the "presence of God *for us*," we are reminded that that office is designed to commend us to God. As our high priest now executes this office with God, so he began to execute it when he first appeared in his presence in the heavenly sanctuary, that is, at the moment when he "offered himself" to God: so that if he now commends us to God by "appearing in "his presence," he must have begun to do this by "offering himself to God."

IV. It is equally evident that Christ offered himself to God in heaven in order to commend to him our prayers and desires. For as the Jewish high priest was a shadowy image of Jesus Christ our high priest, and the inner sanctuary of the temple was a figure of heaven itself; so also the sacred incense which used to be burnt, both in the holy and in the most holy place, represented the prayers of the church. For this reason, as the name of the thing signified is frequently given to the sign, (and it would otherwise be unaccountable,) those sacred odours are called "the "prayers of the saints."* Hence it is that these

* Rev. v. 8.

prayers of the saints are said to be "offered upon "the golden altar;"* that being the altar from which the sacred incense, which was the symbol of those prayers, daily ascended to God. Hence it is that David† compares his prayers with that very incense, as a thing signified with its sign. For the same reason it was, that the Jewish people offered up their prayers in the court, while the high priest was presenting the sacred incense, the symbol of those prayers, to God in the temple:‡ by which rite he symbolically offered to him those prayers which were at the same instant ascending from the people. For what is done with the symbol of any particular thing, may be said to be done symbolically with the thing itself. Wherefore, as the Jewish high priest typified Christ our high priest, as the most holy place was a figure of the highest heavens, and the sacred incense was emblematical of the prayers of the saints, the conclusion is unavoidable, that the Jewish high priest burning this sacred incense before God in the inner sanctuary, prefigured our high priest now in heaven commending to God the prayers of the church. These considerations evince the futility of the objection which Crellius urges against our doctrine;§ namely, that the Jewish high priest offered no prayers to God in the most holy place of the temple, by which he could indicate that Christ would commend our prayers to God in the heavenly sanctuary. For it is clear that the high priest did this very thing in the holy of holies, notwithstanding he uttered no prayers there with his lips, when he solemnly, and according to the prescribed form, offered to God the holy incense, as a symbol of the prayers of his people. For as he

* Rev. viii. 3. † Psalm cxli. 2. ‡ Luke i. 10.

§ Contra Grot. c. x. p. 54.

offered the prayers of his people to God in a symbolical manner; so Christ, laying aside all shadows and symbols, now commends ours to God in reality. Hence the following language of Origen in his answer to Celsus:* 'We honour one God, and his one Son 'and Word and Image, with prayers and supplications 'as far as we are able, bringing our prayers to the 'God of the universe through his only begotten Son, 'to whom we immediately direct them, beseeching 'him who is the propitiation for our sins, that as our 'high priest he will present our prayers and sacrifices 'and supplications to God over all.'

V. In showing that Christ, when he offered himself to God in heaven as a piacular victim previously slain for our sins, commended to God our persons and services in general and our prayers in particular, we have hitherto treated of these things separately, because they were so prefigured in the types, as we have before suggested. Now, as we have already proposed, both are to be demonstrated together. The more easily to perform this, we must remember, what Crellius himself grants, that the *oblation* by which Christ presented himself before God in heaven as a victim slain for our sins, is in fact not at all different from that advocacy on our behalf which is generally called his *pleading* or *intercession*. For that *oblation*, being part of the priestly office connected with the care of our salvation, was the intercession *begun:* and the intercession is the same oblation *continued:* these are only two branches of the same thing. Both are designated by the same expression, where our high priest is said "to appear in the presence of God "for us."† The following remark of Crellius is per-

* Lib. viii. p. 386. Edit. Cantab. † Heb. ix. 24.

fectly correct: 'The oblation and appearance of our 'high priest and also his intercession, provided in-'deed that his appearance and intercession be taken, 'not for a mere approach of Christ to the Father, 'but as they ought to be in this passage, for an ap-'proach connected with the care of our salvation, 'are in fact all one and the same.' The truth we have asserted, therefore, will be fully established, as soon as we shall have proved that Christ our high priest *intercedes* with God for us, so as to perform the office of our advocate with him in this matter. For it is beyond all doubt, that the office of an advocate is to commend the persons and desires of those whose cause he pleads, by those things which are adapted to promote the interest of his clients.

VI. That Christ intercedes with God on our behalf, so as to execute the office of our advocate with him in this matter, is evident from the phrases by which his *intercession* is designated in the scriptures. Such is that passage of John:* "My little children, "these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And "if any man sin, we have (παρακλητον) an *advocate* with "the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is "the propitiation for our sins." The Greek word παρακλητος signifies an *advocate* or *patron*, one who pleads the cause of another. This is sufficiently evinced by the language of Demosthenes,† who mentions 'the supplications and exertions (παρακλητων) of '*advocates*' for their clients. By Philo Judæus,‡ indeed the world itself, figuratively represented by the garments of the high priest, is called 'the son of 'God and (παρακλητος) an *advocate*:' being thought by him to have been symbolically introduced into the

* I John ii. 1, 2. † De Falsa Legatione. ‡ De Vita Mosis. l. 3.

temple as a powerful advocate by the high priest in his official vestments. Whether he was correct in this notion or not, is of no importance to our present subject. It only concerns us to observe in what sense he has called the world an *advocate* with God; which is evident from his own language: 'It was 'necessary that he who was consecrated to the Fa-'ther of the world should employ the son most per-'fect in virtue, as an *advocate* to procure remission 'of sins and an abundance of all good things.' Hence it is evident that in the opinion of Philo, the business of an advocate with God is to procure the favour and benevolence of God towards us. Hence the world, which he here calls an advocate and the son of God, is said by him in another place 'to unite with the high priest in supplications to 'God.'* The word παρακλητος has been borrowed from the Greek by the Targumists and Talmudists, and is used by them with the same force and meaning; which is of importance to our present argument. For as those who transfer words from other languages into their own, often make some change in their signification; it is probable, that the sense in which a Greek term is used by the sacred writers, who were themselves Hebrews, may sometimes be better ascertained from the Jews than from the Greeks themselves. Now the force and meaning of this word among the Jews may be learned from the language of the Targumist on Job;† in which פרקליטא answering to the Greek word παρακλητος, is opposed to קטיגור which answers to the Greek word κατηγορος— and as the latter word denotes an *accuser*, the former must signify a *patron*.

* De Monarchia, l. 3. † Job xxxiii. 23.

But this word is also used in the same sense by the Talmudists;* 'He who performs one precept, obtains for himself (פרקליט) an *advocate:* and he who commits one sin procures for himself (קטיגור) an *accuser.*' These two words are thus explained by Maimonides:† 'The former is a good pleader for a man with a king; the latter on the contrary is a pleader who accuses a man to a king, and endeavours to effect his ruin.' To the same purpose is the language of Bartenora:‡—'The former is an angel patron; but the latter is an accuser.'

And since it is the office of a patron to commend to a judge the interest and desires of his client, so that he may obtain the judge's favour towards him; hence it is that piacular sacrifices and all good actions, as conciliating the divine favour, are called *patrons* with God. 'What is the design of the sacrifice called a sin offering? What is its design? to make expiation. But why does it precede the burnt offering? That it may be as a *patron* before a gift.' Of this passage of the Talmud,§ R. Solomon Jarchi gives the following explanation:‖ 'A burnt offering is a gift, nor is it offered as a proper atonement for transgression; but that the offerer may come into the presence of God, after he has expiated the transgression by repentance. As when any one has rebelled against his king, and has appeased him by *advocates,* when he returns into the royal presence he carries with him a present in his hand.' To these things add the following from the Bava Bathra:¶ 'All the beneficence and goodness of the Israelites in this world are great rewards to them, and power-

* Pirke Avoth, c. 4. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. § Zebach. f. 1, 2.
‖ Ibid. ¶ Fol. 10. 1.

'ful *patrons* with their Father who is in heaven.' Similar to these is what is delivered in the treatise Shabbath,* respecting a future judgment. 'If any 'one has great *patrons*, he is acquitted; but other-'wise he is not acquitted. But these *patrons* are 'each person's penitence and good works.' By these quotations the meaning of this Greek term, as used by the Talmudists, is placed beyond all doubt: to whatever person or thing, or in whatever manner, it is applied, whether properly or metaphorically, the person or thing described as (פרקליט) a *patron* or *advocate* with God, is considered as possessing and exerting an influence by which some one is commended to the divine benevolence and mercy. It is evident that this word was used in the same sense by Origen:† 'Perhaps Moses is therefore said to have interceded 'for the offences of the ancient people, and to have 'procured their pardon, that we may much more 'rely, that Jesus our *Advocate* will procure for us 'from the Father an undoubted pardon; if however 'we are converted to him, and our heart does not 'backslide. As John also says in his epistle:‡ "My 'little children, these things write I unto you, that ye 'sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate 'with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he 'is the propitiation for our sins."'

VII. Is it objected that the Holy Spirit, whom no one represents as our patron commending us to God, is designated in the scriptures by the same appellation?§

* Fol. 32. 1. † Homil. viii. ad Numer. ‡ 1 John ii. 1, 2.

§ Παρακλητος. John xiv. 16. 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7.

TR.—Dr. Campbell, in his note on the first of these passages shows that this term, in all the texts in which it is applied to the Holy Spirit, denotes a *monitor, instructor, guide.* A similar interpretation is given by Schleusner in voc. § 2.

He is so called, because he is introduced "speaking "in" the apostles, and pleading their cause "before "governors and kings:"* so that even from this use of the term we clearly perceive that (though it may be metaphorically applied to him who dictates to any person what he may answer to accusers, which the Holy Spirit did to the apostles, and therefore was said to speak in them) he is properly called a *patron* or *advocate*, who not by dictating, but by himself, defends one person to another. But we desire to explain the sacred oracles so as, whenever the nature of the passages and facts recorded will admit, always to take every word in its strict and proper sense. Unless this be done, the sacred writings will be exposed to the vain imaginations and subtleties of the most injudicious, nor can any thing certain ever be concluded from them. Now to return to our subject; that the word παρακλητος, when applied to Christ,† signifies a *patron* or *advocate* whose efforts are employed with God, is most consistent with the scope of the passage, and is demanded by the nature of the subject. For Christ is both a *patron* and a *priest*. But the office of a *priest* is to commend his people and all their services to God, in the manner of a *patron:* his most peculiar function, as we have elsewhere more fully proved, is exercised immediately with God. These remarks may suffice upon this term: let us now proceed to other proofs of the same doctrine.

VIII. It is clearly inculcated in this passage of the epistle to the Hebrews‡: "But this man, because he "continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the utter-

* Matt. x. 18. 20. † I John ii. 1. ‡ Heb. vii. 24, 25.

"most, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever "liveth *to make intercession for them.*" It is also affirmed in the following language of St. Paul:* "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's "elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that "condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather that "is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, "*who also maketh intercession for us.*" When Christ is said *to intercede for us*,† it implies, that as a patron or advocate he is pleading our cause with God. This may be learned from the use of the verb ἐντυγχανω when connected with the preposition κατα: a phrase which always signifies to *accuse*. This is the sense in which it is employed by the apostle, who declares that Christ intercedes for us:‡ "Wot ye not what the scripture "saith of Elias, how he *maketh intercession* to God "*against* Israel,§ saying, Lord, they have killed thy "prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am "left alone, and they seek my life:" where *making intercession against Israel*, as the scope of the passage itself shows, is equivalent to *accusing Israel.* The same idea is conveyed by the same expression in these words of the Romans to Demetrius:‖ 'If therefore they *intercede* any more *against* thee, we will 'do them justice.' So also the accusers of Jonathan with Demetrius and Alexander, are said to *intercede against* him.¶ The same phrase is used in the same sense by Alexander, in the following address to his princes:** 'Make a proclamation, that no man *intercede against* him for any matter.' *Interceding against* being the opposite of *interceding for*, as the

* Rom. viii. 33, 34. † Εντυγχανειν υπερ ημων. ‡ Rom. xi. 2.
§ Εντυγχανει κατα τον Ισραηλ. ‖ I Maccab. viii. 32.
¶ Ibid. xi, 25. ** Ibid. x. 61.

former is the part of an *accuser*, it necessarily follows that the latter is the part of a *patron:* so that when Christ is said to *intercede for us*, the office assigned to him is that which properly belongs to a *patron* or *advocate.*

IX. Nor must it be concealed that "the Spirit "himself," also is said to "make intercession for us" and to "make intercession for the saints."* But Christ intercedes with God in one way, and the Spirit in another: the Spirit, as an internal advocate who dictates our prayers to God; Christ, as a heavenly patron who appearing in the presence of God, and sitting on the right hand of his throne, commends our prayers to him. So that this phrase is applied to the Spirit in a less strict and proper sense than to Christ. This is obvious from the nature of the thing. For as the proper office of a priest is an advocacy with God on behalf of men; so also Christ intercedes with God for us as a priest. And this is clearly and explicitly taught by the apostle to the Hebrews:† "But this "man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchange-"able priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save "them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, "seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." It deserves to be mentioned, however, that Chrysostom considers the passage in which "the Spirit" is said to "intercede for the saints," as relating not to the Holy Spirit, elsewhere called παράκλητος, but to the spirit of each praying individual excited by the divine influence to obtain by his prayers things conducive to the benefit of the church. But if this were true, I believe our explanation of those phrases which declare any one to intercede for another, even

* Rom. viii. 26, 27. † Heb. vii. 24, 25.

in a merely metaphorical sense, cannot be invalidated by any thing that is to be found in any writings sacred or profane.

Seeing then (to sum up the argument which has been propounded) that Christ, in interceding with God for us, performs the office of our patron or advocate with him; and therefore, as becomes a patron, commends to him our persons and services: seeing also, that he offered himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary as a piacular victim previously slain for our sins, and that this oblation in fact differs not from that intercession, the opinion formed of the one must also be applied to the other: so that if Christ discharges the offices of a patron or advocate with God, while he intercedes with him for us, it necessarily follows that he began to execute that office, when he first presented himself to his Father in the heavenly sanctuary.

X. After what has been said, I think it may be easily understood how Christ living with his Father in the heavenly sanctuary is said "to make reconciliation, for the sins of the people."* This he

* TR.—Heb. ii. 17. Εις το ιλασκεσθαι τας αμαρτιας του λαου—which it is generally agreed should have been translated—"to expiate, or "make atonement for, the sins of the people." This is the only place in the New Testament, in which our translators have used the verb *reconcile*, or its cognate noun, or participles, except in rendering some branches of the words διαλλασσω, καταλλασσω, αποκαταλλασσω, or καταλλαγη: and these words they have so rendered in every instance except one, in which καταλλαγη is translated *atonement*, but it is universally admitted should have been *reconciliation*. Rom. v. 11.

The adversaries of the doctrine of atonement have strangely argued, that, since in the scriptures men are said to be reconciled to God, but God is never said to be reconciled to men, therefore nothing can have been necessary to the reinstatement of sinners in the divine favour, but their laying aside all enmity against God; on whose part it is presumed there is no

does in the character of our high priest, commending to God both our persons and services, and especially those prayers by which we implore the pardon of our sins and the strength requisite to enable us to obey the divine will. This very idea is suggested

wrath or displeasure requiring to be removed, averted, or appeased. It is one of the disadvantages attending all our statements concerning the dispensations and government of God, that we are obliged to use language borrowed from the transactions and passions of men, and even some terms which cannot be applied to mortals without reminding us of their imperfect and sinful condition. But the sacred writers employ the same phraseology; accompanied indeed with various declarations, which teach us to abstract from it, when applied to the Divine Being, all that it generally includes of imperfection, weakness, and error. We are authorised, therefore, to affirm that "God is angry with the wicked," that "his "wrath is revealed against all unrighteousness," and that "judgment and "fiery indignation shall devour" his unreconciled "adversaries." It appears to me sufficient to fix the meaning of the term *reconciliation* in the writings of the evangelists and apostles, and to refute the argument which has just been adverted to; that it is never applied, in the *passive* sense, to any *offended* party throughout the New Testament. Persons offended are described as *exercising forgiveness*, but *not* as *being reconciled*: Christians are enjoined to *forgive* an *offending* and repenting brother, but are no where commanded *to be reconciled* to him. The following are all the passages where any of the Greek words mentioned above are to be found. *Matt.* v. 24. *Rom.* v. 10, 10, 11. xi. 15. I *Cor.* vii. 11. II *Cor.* v. 18, 18, 19, 19, 20. *Ephes.* ii. 16. *Col.* i. 20, 21. Of these passages there are only two, which have not an immediate reference to God as the *object* of reconciliation. *Matth.* v. 24. διαλλαγηθι. I *Cor.* vii. 11. καταλλαγητω. These words appear to be perfectly synonimous, and each is most clearly applied to the *offending* party, who is directed to *be reconciled to* the party *offended*. In affairs between man and man, this is done by the offender making all reasonable or possible reparation or satisfaction for the offence to the party offended, and seeking and obtaining his forgiveness. The satisfaction necessary to reconcile offending men to their offended Maker has been rendered by the Mediator; whose obedience and sufferings, completed in death, vindicated the honours of the law, and fulfilled the demands of justice. This satisfaction being the result of divine appointment, the gospel declares that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," and its invitation to men is, "Be ye reconciled to God;" that is, Seek the forgiveness of your sins, which God has promised to grant to all who seek it through the *reconciliation* effected *by the death of his Son*.

by the apostle to the Hebrews:* "For we have not "an high priest who cannot be touched with the feel-"ing of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted "like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may "obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." Nor do we deny the other idea, that Christ now living in heaven is also said to make reconciliation for our sins, because the succours which he obtained in the character of sacrifice and high priest, in order that we may avoid the sins themselves and escape the punishments due to them, are dispensed by him in the character of heavenly king; and likewise because he himself dispenses to us the pardon of sins by his own authority. For the same reason God also is said to "cleanse us from all unrighteousness."†

XI. "At that day," says Christ,‡ "ye shall ask "in my name: and I say not unto you, that I will "pray the Father for you: for the Father himself "loveth you, because ye have loved me." But let it be remarked, that these words are not to be understood as if our Lord had said, that when he should have entered into heaven he would never afterwards commend his apostles to his Father. The language of Christ was not, *I say that I will not pray the Father for you;* but, "I say not that I will pray the "Father for you." What then would have been the object of the former declaration? Would it have been, what Christ here proposed to himself, to assure his apostles that they should obtain all that they would ask of God in his name? Its tendency would evidently have been altogether different. For the less

* Heb. iv. 15, 16.

† I John i. 9. ‡ John xvi. 26.

they had been allowed to hope that their prayers would be commended to the Father by Christ, so much the less must have been their hope that their prayers would be heard. Whence it is evident that the words of Christ just cited convey the following sentiment. 'For the present I pass over the consi-'deration, that after I shall have left the world and 'gone to heaven, I shall commend you to my Fa-'ther: for I now propose something greater for your 'consolation, that because ye have loved me, the 'Father himself loveth you: so that you have no 'reason to doubt that you shall always obtain those 'things which you implore of him in my name.' It is not uncommon for Christ, when speaking of two things, to pass by one of them, and in appearance to exclude that which in reality however he does not exclude, in order that he may the more illustrate and magnify the other. This is clearly the case in the following passages. "He that believeth on me, "believeth not on me, but on him that sent me." "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: "there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in "whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye "would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But "if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe "my words?"* Here Christ does not deny that the unbelieving Jews would be accused and condemned by his words, for this he in another place expressly affirms:† but he teaches, what the Jews thought would never come to pass, that they would be clearly condemned by the writings of Moses himself. The same principle of interpretation is applicable to the words before cited: in which Christ does not deny

* John xii. 44. v. 45---47. † John xii. 48.

that he would commend his apostles to the Father, but teaches that the benevolence of the Father towards them was so great, that they would easily obtain whatever they should pray for in his name. This passage has been explained in a similar manner by Zeger, Grotius, Menochius, and many others, particularly James Capellus.

XII. Thus we have treated of the several parts of which the sacrifice of Christ has been stated to consist. The *first* was the oblation by which he gave himself up to die as a piacular victim. The *second* was his death itself. The *third* was that oblation by which he presented himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary, as a piacular victim previously slain for our sins. Which though we conceive to be a correct statement, we would not object to any person who has formed a different opinion stating the subject according to his own judgment, provided he be willing invariably, and strenuously to maintain three points. The *first* is, that the sacrifice of Christ in whatever particulars it is included, immediately and chiefly has respect to God. This we have proved to belong to all sacrifices, so that in the sacred scriptures nothing is ever called a sacrifice, even in a metaphorical sense, except what either in its own nature immediately and chiefly respects God, as prayers and thanksgivings, or has some tendency to conciliate his favour; as benefits conferred upon the necessitous and other similar actions rightly performed: which receiving the appellation of sacrifices for no other reason than because they properly have respect to God, and tend to obtain his favour, it is evident that sacrifices properly so called must clearly have the same tendency. For nothing could be called a sacrifice in a metaphorical

sense, in consequence of its having actual respect to God, and tending to conciliate his favour, unless sacrifices properly so called had the same relation and tendency. Moreover, as the sacrifice of Christ belongs to the class of piacular sacrifices, it must also be maintained in the *second* place, that it had respect to God in such a way as that its design was to procure from him the remission of sins: which was evidently the proper end and design of every piacular victim, whether sin offering or trespass offering. The *last* point is, that every one, in treating of the sacrifice of our Lord, ought to consider his death as designed to be a vicarious punishment: a sentiment enforced by the design of an expiatory victim and by the express representation of the scriptures. The last two points, in which the first is also included, were maintained as other writers have sufficiently shown by the common consent of all the early Christians; and have been embraced with a firm and constant faith by the universal church.

XIII. Concerning the kingdom* given to Christ as Mediator (between which and his priesthood, as explained by us, Crellius thinks there can be no connection or agreement) we hold the following opinion.—That Christ can do all things that he will; but that he wills nothing which is not also agreeable to God, and that he wills every thing that is agreeable to him. That it is highly pleasing to God, as tending to illustrate

* Let it be observed that in all the remarks we have made concerning the kingdom of Christ, we mean, not that natural kingdom which belongs to the Eternal Word; but that which the scripture declares to have been given to Christ as Mediator, on account of his perfect obedience to God in all things, especially in his voluntary death; and which is at length to be "delivered up to God, even the Father." *Philip.* ii. 8—11. I *Cor.* xv. 24.

and magnify that honour which he would have to be peculiarly his own, that Jesus Christ whom he has constituted the Mediator* on behalf of men with him, as well as on his part with men, should not only teach his people truths, regulate them by laws, succour them with the aids of his Spirit, and raise them to eternal life, but also, as their patron or advocate, commend them to him. Not that God vacates the throne of his majesty,† or has committed the kingdom to Christ as Mediator, so as to abdicate it himself, or put himself in subjection to Christ:‡ that if this were the case no prayers could be duly offered, except to Christ as Mediator; and the contrary must have been erroneously practised by the apostles and the universal church. That Christ is constituted the judge of all, that he now administers all things, but according to the will of God. That it cannot be, that he "in whom we live and move and have our be-"ing,"§ who is omnipresent and omniscient, should have no will or thought about things relating to us, but should consider himself as having no business with them; that he should have committed all things to the administration of Jesus Christ, so as to determine nothing himself respecting our affairs, but to be altogether careless about them. That therefore the will of God relates to us men as well as to all other things, and that Christ as our high priest is chiefly desirous and concerned that the will of God may be favourable and propitious towards us, and that with this view he commends both our persons and services to the divine regard. That in this principally consists that advocacy of Christ which is denominated his *in-*

* I Tim. ii. 5. † Heb. i. 3. xii. 2. ‡ I Cor. xv. 27.
§ Acts xvii. 28.

tercession. And lastly, that these things prove the existence of an intimate connection between the regal and sacerdotal offices of Christ, and that neither of them is at all incompatible with the other.

INDEX

OF THE

PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

The large numeral Letters indicate the Dissertation; the small Letters, the Chapter; and the Figures, the Section.

A.

Aaron, consecration of him and his sons to the priesthood, by ablution, I. v. 1.—clothing with the appointed vestments, 2. 4.—unction, 3.—and sacrifice, 5, 6.

Abel's oblation, I. i. 3—6.

Adjuration, forms of, among the Jews, I. xii. 9.

Altar of incense, I. ii. 2.—of sacrifice, or great altar, I. viii. 1. xv. 3.—an altar a sacred table, viii. 7.—the table of shew bread a kind of altar, viii. 7.

Animals, what species appointed for sacrifices by the law of Moses, I. ix. 1.

Antitype possesses in reality what the type figuratively represented, I. xviii. 2. xxi. 7.

Atonement by piacular victims, I. xxii.—by the death of Christ, II. vi.

B.

Birds, what species appointed for sacrifices, I. ix. 1.—to be slain by the priests only, and why, xv. 2.—in what manner to be sacrificed, xvi. 7.

Blood of victims, where, how, and by whom to be sprinkled, I. xvi. 2—4.—this the most sacred of all the sacrificial rites, 6.—the sprinkling of the blood of a victim, the solemn presentation of its life to God, I. xxi. 6. II. v. 6.

Burnt Offerings—the original term explained, I. x. 5.—the most ancient kind of sacrifices, x. i. 5.—offered in compliance with express injunctions; also as votive and voluntary oblations, 6.—their particular design; sometimes piacular, 7.—the only sacrifices, according to the Jews, which might be offered at the temple by Gentiles, 8.—design of the daily burnt offerings, xiv. 5. xx. 2.

C.

Christ—typified by all the Jewish Sacrifices, I. i. 10. xviii. 5.—more eminently by those whose blood was carried into the sanctuary, and whose carcasses were burnt without the camp, xviii. 6. II. iii. 2.—his sacrifice had respect to God, I. xx. 8. II. vii. 12.—whatever was prefigured in the types, to be attributed to him, I. xxi. 5.—described as a ransom, xxii. 2.—general business of his priesthood, an advocacy with God on behalf of men, II. i. 1.—a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not of Aaron, 2.—how consecrated to his priestly office, 3, 4.—his priesthood real, not figurative—proved by various texts and arguments, ii.—his priestly and kingly offices distinct, ii. 4.—but not incompatible with each other, vii. 13.—how he commends us to God or intercedes for us, ii. 9.—his sacrifice belongs to the piacular class, iii. 1.—in what it consists, 3.—offered himself to be slain as a piacular victim, 3.—prayers by which he consecrated or devoted himself to death, 3.—offered himself in heaven as a piacular victim previously slain, II. vii. 1.—sustained in his sacrifice the threefold character of offerer, victim, and high priest, iii. 4.—by his voluntary death accomplished what could not have been effected by it if involuntary, iv. 1.—by his obedience unto death he established the authority of the gospel, 2.—gave an example to his followers, 3.—obtained as Mediator authority over the universe and favour with God, and procured gifts for men, 4.—the design and efficacy of his death threefold, v. 1.—his death a vicarious punishment, v.—distinction between Christ being punished for us, and our being punished in him, v. 10.—his death expiatory, vi. 1.—proved by redemption being ascribed to it, 2, 3.—by his being called a ransom, 4.—by his blood being shed for the remission of sins, 5.—by his being made a curse, 6.—by his being described as a propitiation, 7.—remission of sins attributed to his death, 8, 9.—nature of his satisfaction, 10.—declared to have suffered for sins, 11.—to have died for us, and for the ungodly, 12.—operation of his vicarious punishment, 13.—his death as a piacular victim consistent with the divine justice and grace, 13.—commends to God our persons and services and especially our prayers, vii. 2—4.—discharges in heaven the office of an advocate, 6—9.—why said to make reconciliation for sins in heaven, 10.—his mediatorial kingdom, 13.

Congregation—Sacrifices of the whole congregation of Israel, some occasional, I. xiv. 1—3.—others stated; daily, weekly, monthly, and annual, 4, 5.—The whole congregation offered only prescribed sacrifices, none votive or voluntary, 3.

D.

Damage done to a neighbour, what compensation required for it by the Mosaic law, I. xiii. 3.

Drink Offerings, I. viii. 4.

E.

Eucharistic Sacrifices, why offered, I. xi. 5.—a species of Peace Offerings, 6, 7.—always to be accompanied with bread, xvii. 9.
Expiation—See *Atonement*.

F.

Fat, two kinds; one to be burnt on the altar, the other to be eaten, I. xvi. 11.
Fire, descended from heaven upon the altar; how preserved and when extinguished, I. xvi. 13.
Firstborn Males of the Israelites devoted to God, I. iv. 2.
First Fruits, oblation of, I. viii. 7.
Frankincense to be added to some of the Meat Offerings, I. viii. 9.
Flour, different portions appointed for Meat Offerings with different victims, I. viii. 5.

H.

Heathens regarded their temples as habitations of their gods, I. iii. 9.—often united the kingly and priestly offices in the same persons, iv. 3.—practised ablutions in their worship, v. 1.—had oblations of flour and salt, viii. 6.—offered all kinds of roots, herbs, and fruits, 12.—and almost all species of animals, ix. 1.—were careful to select for victims such as were free from blemish, 3.—and of certain ages, 5.—had their whole burnt sacrifices, x. 9.—their votive and voluntary sacrifices, xi. 4.—connected prayers with sacrifices, xv. 9. 12. xx. 5.—poured blood round their altars, xvi. 2.—considered piacular victims as polluted, xvii. 3. xxii. 15.—regarded sacrifices as parts of divine worship, and as having propitiatory efficacy, xx. 4—6.—imprecated on animal victims the evils they thought likely to fall upon themselves, xxii. 13.—and sometimes on human victims, 14.—their opinion of the substitution of victims, 16, 17.
High Priest, Jewish—his dignity and functions, I. iv. 5.—consecration, v.—garments, v. 2.—in offering the incense, symbolically offered to God the prayers of the people, II. vii. 4.
Holiness—two kinds, I. i. 1, 2.—to what places attributed in the scriptures, iii. 2.—different degrees of holiness attributed to different places by the Jews, 8.
Holocaust—See *Burnt Offerings*.
Holy Spirit called an advocate, II. vii. 7.—said to intercede, 9.
Honey never used in Jewish sacrifices, I. viii. 9.

I.

Idolaters—who considered as such by the Jews, I. xix. 9.
Impurities, corporeal, to be purged by piacular sacrifices, I. xii. 4.

Incense, when, where, and how to be burnt; emblematical of prayers, I. viii. 11. II. vii. 4.
Intercession—See *Christ*.

K.

Killing victims, how and where performed, I. xvi. 1.
Kings, in what cases anointed, I. v. 7.

L.

Leaven, none to be burnt on the altar, I. viii. 7.—supposed reason of this prohibition, 9.
Leprosy, what sins the Jews have supposed to be punished by it, I. xii. 6.
Levites, assistants of the priests; consecrated by lustration, tonsure, imposition of hands, and sacrifice, I. vii. 1.—the duties of their office, 2.—age at which they entered on their office, 3.
Lustral Water purified the defiled, and polluted the pure, I. vii. 1.

M.

Meat Offerings, composed of wheaten flour or barley meal, mixed with oil;—sometimes accompanied with wine, and then called *Drink Offerings;*—to be connected with animal sacrifices, I. viii. 4.—of different quantities on different occasions, 5.—Meat Offerings without wine for the whole congregation, 7.—for individuals;—a meat offering sometimes substituted for a sin offering, 8.—further regulations concerning meat offerings, 9, 10.
Melchisedec, why called "a priest for ever," I. iv. 3.—his priesthood distinguished from that of Aaron;—whether he offered only inanimate oblations, II. i. 2.

N.

Names of the tribes, why engraven on the high priest's breast-plate and ephod, I. v. 3.
Nazarites defiled by a dead body, required to offer a piacular victim, I. xii. 9.
Nethinims, descendants of the Gibeonites, assisted the Levites in the inferior labours of the sanctuary, I. vii. 4.

O.

Oaths, the Jews reckon four kinds, I. xii. 10.
Offering of sacrifices twofold; before the victim was slain, and after, I. xv. 3, 4. II. iii. 3.
Oil to be added to some of the meat offerings, I. viii. 9.

P.

Parents—some eminent men described by heathen writers as without parents, I. iv. 3.

Paschal Sacrifice, to whom commanded; origin of its name; when to be slain, I. xiii. 10.—properly called a sacrifice, and of what class, 11.

Peace Offerings—original term explained; design of this class of sacrifices, I. xi. 1.—of three kinds, votive, voluntary, and eucharistic, 2.—occasion and design of each, 3, 5.—the eucharistic included the ram of the Nazarite, sacrifices of festivity and rejoicing, firstlings, and tithes, 6.—peace offerings always preceded by a piacular sacrifice, xvii. 6.

Prayers and Sacrifices, agreement and difference between them, I. x. 2. xix. 14.

Priesthood supposed to have been first one of the privileges of primogeniture, I. iv. 1.—but without sufficient reason, 2.—first exercised by each person for himself, and by each father of a family for his household; afterwards by princes for their communities, 3.—among the Israelites, assigned exclusively to the family of Aaron, 4.—orders, degrees, and functions of the Aaronic priesthood, 5.—priestly office defined, II. i. 1.

Priests Aaronic—their original consecration, I. v. 1—6.—regulations respecting their successors, 7.—garments of the high priest, 2.—garments of the common priests, 4.—qualifications required, and regulations for the performance of their functions, vi. 1, 2.—age at which they entered on their office, vii. 3.

Punishment—what punishment averted from the offenders by piacular victims, I. xxi. 10.

S.

Sacrifice, the term explained, I. i. 2.—different opinions on the origin of sacrifices; arguments for their divine origin, 3.—arguments for their human origin, 4, 5.—opinions of Christian fathers and Jewish rabbies on this subject, 6.—sacrifices divinely enjoined on the Israelites on their departure from Egypt, 7.—reasons assigned by Christian fathers and Jewish rabbies for this appointment, 8, 9.—designed by God to typify the sacrifice of Christ, 10.—Places used for offering sacrifices, ii. 1.—Ministers of sacrifices, See *Priesthood* and *Priests*.—What considered as sacrifices by the Jews, viii. 1, 2.—some inanimate, as the meat offerings and incense; some animal, as the various kinds of victims, 3.—all sacrifices parts of divine worship, x. 2.—offered either for individuals, or for families, or for small neighbourhoods, or for the whole congregation of Israel, 4.—all distributed by the Jews into two orders, 6.—Efficacy of all sacrifices had respect to God, xix. 1, 2.—this proved by the place where they were offered, 3.—the nature of the priestly office, 4, 5.—the selection of victims, 6.—the sacrificial rites, 7, 8.—the nature of divine worship, 9, 10.—the sacrificial prayers, 11.—the metaphorical use of the term *sacrifice*, 12.—and, in reference to piacular victims, by the relation subsisting between God and the offerers, 13.—summary of the argu-

ment, 14.—testimonies on this subject from Jews, xx. 1—3.—and from Christian fathers, 7.—See

Burnt Offerings.
Congregation.
Incense.
Meat Offerings.
Peace Offerings.
Sin Offerings.
Trespass Offerings.
Victims.

Sacrificial Rites, for burnt offerings and for other victims, I. xv. 1.—some to be performed by the offerers, some by the priests, some by any persons ceremonially clean, 2.—offering before the altar, 3, 4.—waving, 5.—imposition of hands, 6, 7.—prayers connected with that ceremony, 8, 9.—forms of confession, deprecation, and supplication, from Jewish writers, 10, 11.—killing, xvi. 1.—sprinkling the blood, 2—6.—flaying, 7.—cutting up, 8—10.—parts brought to the altar, 11, 12.—select parts burnt on the altar, 13.—process about birds, I. 7.

Septenary Number, remarks on its use in the scriptures, I. xvi. 5.

Shew Bread, I. viii. 7.

Shoes not to be worn in the sanctuary, I. vi. 2.

Sins symbolically transferred to the piacular victims, I. xxi. 3. 7.—in what sense Christ is said to *bear* them, II. v. 2—5. 8—10.

Sin Offerings, divided by the Jews into two sorts, I. xii. 1.—of what they consisted, and on what occasions they were to be offered, 2—10.—points of agreement and difference between sin offerings and trespass offerings, xiii. 9.

Souls of Martyrs, why represented as under the altar, I. xvi. 6.

Stationary Men, representatives of the nation in the services of the sanctuary, I. ii. 6.

Substitution of the victim for the offender, I. xxii. 9.

T.

Tabernacle, its two sanctuaries, and the furniture of each;—its courts and altars, I. ii. 2.

Temple, its sanctuaries with their furniture; its courts and altars, 3.—second temple, description of its courts, rooms, and officers, 4—6.—tabernacle and temple, successively, designed for God's residence, iii. 1—4.—temple, how esteemed by the Jews, 5, 6.—held in high reverence, 7, 8.—metaphorical use of the term *temple* in the scriptures, 4.

Tithe Cattle sacred to God; mode of titling as described by Maimonides, I. xi. 7.

Trespass Offerings—divided by the Jews into two sorts, doubtful and certain, I. xiii. 1.—of what they consisted, and on what occasions they were

to be offered, 2—8.—points of agreement and difference between trespass offerings and sin offerings, xiii. 9.

Type, defined; distinguished from a simile, and from a symbol, I. xviii. 1.—compared with the antitype, 2.—the true nature of a type further considered, 3.—all the Jewish sacrifices types of Christ, 4, 5.—more particularly, those victims which were to be burnt without the camp, 6.

V.

Vicarious Punishment, its nature and design, I. xxi. 1.—its infliction on the piacular victims, 2.—confirmed by various proofs, 3—11.—agreement between vicarious punishment and the punishment of the sinner himself, 12.—difference between them, 13.—different operation of them: vicarious punishment consistent with remission of sins, 14.—application of this to Christ, 15.—testimonies of Christian fathers on this subject, xxii. 1—3.—of Jewish rabbies on the same, 4—12.

Vestments of the high priest, I. v. 2.—of the common priests, 4.

Victims among the Jews, very select as to kind, I. ix. 1.—condition, 2.—age, 4—6.—and sex, 7.—different classes of victims, x. 1.—how and where to be slain, xvi. 1.—victims to be burned without the camp, xvii. 1—3.—victims to be eaten, by whom and where, 4—5.—and within what time, 7—9.—if kept beyond the appointed time, to be burnt, 8.

Votive and *Voluntary* sacrifices were either burnt offerings or peace offerings, and of no other class, I. xiii. 9.

W.

Waving sacrifices described; its signification, I. xv. 5. xvi. 9.

Worship, natural and instituted, has the same object, I. x. 3.—Sacrificial worship should be accompanied by inward devotion, xix. 14.

Wine to be added to some of the meat offerings, I. viii. 9.

INDEX OF TEXTS

EXPLAINED OR REFERRED TO.

GENESIS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
ii. 2, 3.....	1	16	5
iv. 3, 4.....	1	1	5
	1	4	3
7.	1	4	2
viii. 20.....	1	10	5
ix. 4.	1	16	6
xii. 6, 7.....	1	3	2
xiv. 17—19.....	2	1	2
18.....	1	4	3
xxvi. 28—30.....	1	17	5
xxxi. 46.....	1	17	5
xliii. 33.....	1	4	2
xlviii. 14. 16. 20.	1	15	8
xlix. 9, ...	1	18	1

EXODUS.

iii. 5.	1	3	2
	1	6	2 16
x. 25.....	1	10	1
xii. 3—6.....	1	13	10
3—10.	1	17	5
13, 14. 25 —27.	1	13	11
15.....	1	12	3
27.....	1	13	10
xiii. 13. 15.	1	11	6
xiv. 8.	1	5	2
xv. 17.....	1	3	1, 2
xvi. 10.....	1	3	2
xviii. 12.	1	10	1

EXODUS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
xix. 6.	2	2	1
22.	1	19	4
xx. 7.	1	13	5
11.....	1	16	5
26	1	5	2
xxii. 1. 4. 6, 7. 11.	1	13	3
20.	1	19	9
	1	20	7
xxiii. 17.	1	8	3
xxiv. 5.	1	4	1, 2
6.	1	4	2, 3
16.....	1	3	2
xxv. 8.	1	3	1
22.....	1	2	2
	1	3	3
	1	3	8
xxviii. 6. 12. 15, 16. 26. 28, 29. 31. 40 —43.	1	5	2
12.....	1	3	3
40—43.....	1	6	2 10
41.....	1	19	4, 5
	1	19	9
xxix. 4.	1	5	1
5, 6.	1	5	2
7.	1	5	3
8, 9.	1	5	4
14. 22.	1	17	6
18.	1	19	12

EXODUS.

		Dis.	ch.	sec.
xxix.	20.	1	5	7
	22—25.	1	5	6
	29, 30.	1	5	7
	31.	1	5	6
	35. 37.	1	19	5
	44.	1	19	4
xxx.	7, 8.	1	8	11
	8.	1	3	3
	12. 15, 16.	1	21	10
	20, 21.	1	6	2 14
	25.	1	5	3
	30.	1	19	4
	31—33.	1	5	7
	33—38.	1	12	3
xxxi.	14.	1	12	3
xxxiv.	7.	2	5	2
	14, 15.	1	19	9
	24.	1	3	3
xxxix.	8, 9. 22—26. 30, 31.	1	5	2
xl.	6. 29.	1	8	1
		1	15	3
	13. 15.	1	19	4

LEVITICUS.

i.	3.	1	15	3
	4.	1	15	6
		1	19	6
	5.	1	3	3
		1	15	2, 3
		1	16	2
	6. 9. 11—13.	1	15	2
	8.	1	16	13
	9.	1	16	10
	9. 13.	1	19	12
	11.	1	15	6
		1	16	1
	15.	1	15	2
	16, 17.	1	16	7
ii.	1. 4, 5. 7.	1	8	8

LEVITICUS.

		Dis.	ch.	sec.
ii.	11. 13.	1	8	9
iii.	2. 8, 13.	1	15	6
		1	16	2
	5. 16.	1	19	12
iv.	2, 3. 14. 23. 28. 32.	1	12	2
	2. 22. 27.	1	13	2
	3. 5. 16.	1	5	7
	3. 13.	1	16	3
	3—21.	1	18	7
	4—14.	1	15	3
	4. 23. 28. 32.	1	12	4
	4. 24. 29.	1	15	6
	5.	1	16	2
	5—7.	1	15	2
	6, 7. 17, 18.	1	16	3
	7.	1	15	3
	7. 18. 25. 30.	1	13	9
	11.	1	17	1
	12.	1	17	1, 2
	13, 14.	1	13	4
		1	14	1, 2
	14—18.	1	15	2
	15.	1	15	7
		1	19	4
	16.	1	16	2
	21.	1	17	1, 2
	22, 23. 27, 28.	1	13	4
	25. 34.	1	16	2
	31.	1	19	12
v.		1	12	8
	1.	1	13	5
	2, 3, 4.	1	13	4
	4—13.	1	12	9
	5.	1	12	9
		1	15	9
	5—13.	1	8	8
	6.	1	13	8
	7.	1	16	7
	8.	1	15	2

LEVITICUS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
v. 8.	1	16	1
15.	1	13	8
15, 16.	1	13	3
17.	1	13	2, 5
18.	1	13	2, 4
vi. 2, 3.	1	12	9
	1	13	4
2—4.	1	13	8
2—6.	1	13	3
16.	1	17	4
20—23.	1	8	8
25.	1	15	6
	1	16	1
30.	1	17	1
vii. 2.	1	13	9
	1	15	6
	1	16	1, 2
11.	1	11	2
12.	1	11	2, 6
	1	17	7, 9
13.	1	8	7
	1	17	9
15, 16.	1	17	7
16.	1	11	2
17.	1	17	8
20, 21.	1	12	3
21.	1	17	4
23. 25.	1	16	11
25. 27, 28.	1	12	3
30.	1	15	1
	1	16	9
33, 34.	1	17	4
viii. 6.	1	5	1
7—9.	1	5	2
11.	1	16	5
12.	1	5	3
13.	1	5	4
22.	1	5	6
23, 24.	1	5	5
	1	6	2 18

LEVITICUS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
viii. 25—30.	1	5	6
33.	1	16	5
33, 34.	1	5	7
x. 1, 2.	1	16	13
3.	1	19	4
6.	1	6	2
			12, 13
9, 10.	1	6	2 9
19.	1	6	2 8
xi. 28. 40.	1	12	8
xii. 6.	1	15	3
6. 8.	1	16	7
8.	1	10	6
xiv.	1	10	7
8.	1	16	5
10.	1	8	4
12.	1	13	3
	1	15	1. 5
16.	1	16	5
19, 20.	1	10	6
22.	1	16	7
23.	1	15	3
24.	1	15	5
31.	1	8	4
51.	1	16	5
xv. 5.	1	17	1
13.	1	16	5
14.	1	15	3
15. 30.	1	10	6
	1	12	4
	1	16	7
24.	1	16	5
29.	1	15	3
31.	1	12	3
xvi.	1	8	11
5, 6.	1	14	4
6.	1	13	10
6. 11.	1	15	10
7—9.	1	19	4
12.	1	16	13

LEVITICUS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
xvi. 14, 15.	1	14	4
	1	15	2
	1	16	2. 4
16. 18, 19...	1	16	4
21.	1	15	7, 8
21, 22. 26. .	1	17	2
24.	1	10	6
27.	1	17	1, 2
27, 28.	1	7	1
28.	1	3	8
xvii. 3—6	1	11	1
4.	1	12	3
4—6	1	2	1
	1	8	1
4—6. 9.....	1	15	3
11.	1	19	1
	1	21	3
	1	22	11
	2	5	6
14.	1	16	6
xviii. 5—7.....	1	15	3
20.	1	21	3
xix. 8.	1	12	3
20, 21.	1	13	3, 8
30.	1	3	7
xx. 4, 5, 6.	1	12	3
xxi. 1—3.5—11.	1	6	2 5
7. 14.	1	6	2 2
10.	1	6	2 13
10, 11. 13. .	1	4	5
17. 21.	1	6	2 3
21.	1	19	4
21—23.....	1	6	2 8
22.	1	6	2 2
xxii. 2, 3.	2	3	3
4.	1	6	2 5
	1	17	4
6, 7.....	1	6	2 6
10—13.....	1	17	4
20,21.23.25.	1	19	6

LEVITICUS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
xxii. 22. 24.	1	9	2
25.	1	10	8
27.	1	9	4
xxiii.	1	3	8
10—13.....	1	3	5
10. 17.	1	20	3
12. 18, 19..	1	14	4
20.	1	15	1. 5
	1	17	4
29, 30.	1	12	3
xxiv. 5—9.	1	8	7
14.	1	1	8
xxv. 4. 8—10 ..	1	16	5
xxvi. 2.	1	3	7
11, 12.	1	3	1
30.	1	2	1
xxvii. 32.	1	11	7

NUMBERS.

iii. 10.	1	6	2
			2, 10.
13.	1	4	2
13. 47.	1	11	6
iv. 3.	1	7	3
v. 3.	1	3	1
7, 8.	1	1	
15.	1	8	8
vi. 6.	1	12	8
9, 12.....	1	13	3
10, 11.	1	12	4
11.	1	16	7
11. 14.	1	10	6
14. 16, 17..	1	17	6
17.	1	11	6
19.	1	17	4
19, 20.	1	15	1
	1	16	9
23.	2	1	2
vii. 7—9.....	1	7	2
8, 9.	1	2	2

NUMBERS.

		Dis.	ch.	sec.
vii.	10.	1	8	1
	89.	1	3	3
viii.	7. 9, 10.....	1	7	1
	10, 11. 13..	1	8	1
	17.	1	4	1, 2
	18, 19.	1	7	1
	24.	1	7	3
ix.	7. 13.....	1	13	11
xiv.	18.	2	5	2
xv.	... .	1	8	5
	2.	1	8	4
	20, 21.	1	8	10
		1	17	4
	22—24.....	1	14	2
		1	18	7
	24.	1	14	1
	30.	1	13	5, 6
xviii.	9—11.	1	17	4
	15.	1	11	6
	16.	1	4	2
	17, 18.	1	11	6
		1	17	4
	19.	1	8	9
	26—28.....	1	8	10
xix.	2, 3, 4. 13. .	1	14	3
	2—3. 13. ..	1	7	1
	3—5. 8.....	1	17	1
	4. 12. 19. ..	1	16	5
	4.	2	5	6
	14. 22.	1	6	2 5
	17—19, 21.	1	7	1
	19, 20.	1	12	8
	20.	11	2	3
xxiii.	.....	1	10	5
xxiv.	15.	1	16	3
xxvii.	18, 23.	1	15	8
xxviii.	3,4.9—1. 14, 15. 19. 22. 24. 27.	1	14	4
	29.	1	8	4

NUMBERS.

		Dis.	ch.	sec.
xxviii.	30, 31.	1	14	4
xxix.	2. 5, 6. 8. 13—38. ..	1	14	4
xxxiii.	3.	1	5	2
xxxv.	9.	1	12	2

DEUTERONOMY.

ii.	16.	1	13	10
viii.	8.	1	8	10
xii.	6, 7.	1	17	4, 5
	8.	1	2	1
	13, 14.	1	3	3
	15.	1	11	1
	17. 26, 27. .	1	17	4
xv.	20—22.....	1	11	6
xvi.	2. 10—12...	1	11	6
	16.	1	10	6
xvii.	1.	1	19	6
	20.	1	5	7
xviii.	3.	1	17	4
	5.	1	6	2 15
xix.	1—6.....	1	12	2
xx.	2—4.....	1	4	5
xxi.	1—9.....	1	14	3
		2	5	6
	5.	1	4	4
		2	1	2
	8.	2	6	7
	17.	1	4	2
xxiii.	4.	2	1	2
	14.	1	3	1
	18.	1	9	2
xxv.	2.	1	21	13
xxvi.	2—8.....	1	8	10
	14.	1	6	2 8
xxxi.	10, 11.	1	19	3
xxxii.	16, 17.	1	19	9
	43.	1	21	3
xxxiii.	5.	1	4	2
xxxiv.	9.	1	15	8

JOSHUA.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
v. 15.	1	6	2 16
vi. 3, 4.	1	16	5
ix. 14, 15.	1	17	5
21.	1	7	4
xxiv. 26.	1	3	2

JUDGES.

viii. 5, 6. 15.	2	1	2
xi. 30, 31.	1	11	3
xviii. 31.	1	2	1

I SAMUEL.

i. 24.	1	2	1
ii. 18.	1	5	4
iii. 14.	2	6	7
vii. 9.	1	14	3
ix. 12, 13.	1	2	1
xiii. 12.	1	19	10
xv. 22.	1	1	7
xxii. 18.	1	5	4
xxvi. 16.	1	21	13

II SAMUEL.

xv. 7, 8.	1	11	3

I KINGS.

viii. 11.	1	3	2
13.	1	3	1
ix. 3.	1	3	2

II KINGS.

v. 10. 14	1	16	5
18.	2	6	7
xxiii. 9.	1	6	2 1
30, 31, 36.	1	5	7

I CHRONICLES.

xvi. 1, 2.	1	14	3
xxiii. 4, 5.	1	7	2
13.	1	4	4

I CHRONICLES.

xxiii. 13.	2	1	2
	2	3	3
26.	1	7	2
27.	1	7	3
28, 29.	1	7	2
xxviii. 12.	1	3	6

II CHRONICLES.

iv. 2. 4. 7—9	1	2	3
vii.	1	14	3
12.	1	19	8
xiii. 5.	1	8	9
xviii. 15.	1	12	9
xxviii. 14.	1	14	2
xxix 3.	1	14	2
20—24.	1	15	7
21—24.	1	14	2
24. 34.	1	15	2
30.	1	11	5
xxx. 16, 17.	1	15	2
xxxiii. 16.	1	11	5
xxxiv. 6. 11.	1	7	2
xxxv. 11.	1	13	11

EZRA.

viii. 20.	1	7	4
35.	1	14	2
x. 19.	1	13	3

NEHEMIAH.

x. 34.	1	8	1
xiii. 31.	1	8	1

JOB.

i. 5.	1	10	5
xxxiii. 23.	2	7	6
xlii. 8.	1	10	5

PSALMS.

ii. 6.	1	3	2

PSALMS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
xii. 6.	1	16	5
xvi. 30.	1	21	3
xix. 12.	1	21	3
xx. 3.	1	19	11
xlv. 7.	1	5	3
li. 2.	1	21	3
18, 19.	1	10	6
lvi. 12, 13.	1	11	3
lxvi. 13, 14.	1	11	3
13—15.	1	10	6
lxviii. 17.	1	3	2
lxxx. 1.	1	3	8
xcix. 1.	1	3	8
3.	1	1	1
6.	1	4	2
cvi. 39.	1	21	3
cxvi. 16, 17.	1	11	5
cxli. 2.	2	7	4

PROVERBS.

xv. 8.	1	19	10
xxiv. 16.	1	16	5
xxvi. 25.	1	16	5
xxviii. 9.	1	19	2
xxix. 24.	1	12	9

ECCLESIASTES.

v. 1.	1	3	7

ISAIAH.

i. 11.	1	1	7
iv. 1.	1	16	5
vi. 7.	1	21	3
xxix. 14.	1	19	4
xlvii. 11.	1	21	3
liii. 4.	2	5	8. 10
5.	2	5	4, 5
6.	2	5	2, 3
7.	1	19	3
10.	2	5	5

ISAIAH.

liii. 10.	2	6	4
12.	2	5	2. 5

JEREMIAH.

ii. 23.	1	21	3
vii. 21, 22.	1	1	5
22, 23.	1	1	7
xv. 9.	1	16	5

EZEKIEL.

xx. 7. 18. 21.	1	21	3
xxii. 3.	1	21	3
xl. 46.	1	19	4
xliv. 9.	1	6	2 4
10—13.	1	6	2 1
15.	1	3	3
15, 16.	1	19	4
20.	1	6	2 13
22.	1	6	2 2

DANIEL.

i. 8.	1	11	2
ix. 24.	2	6	7

HOSEA.

ix. 4.	1	6	2 8
xiv. 2.	1	19	10

JONAH.

i. 16.	1	11	4
ii. 9.	1	11	3

MICAH.

vi. 6—8.	1	1	7

MALACHI.

i. 8. 10. 13.	1	19	6
i. 12.	1	8	7
	1	17	5

MATTHEW.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
viii. 17.	2	5	8
x. 18. 20.	2	7	7
xii. 5.	1	16	7
xv. 18. 20.	1	21	3
xvii. 2. 5.	1	3	2
xix. 15.	1	15	8
xx. 28.	1	21	6
	2	6	4
xxvi. 23.	1	12	9
28.	2	5	6
	2	6	5. 12
38, 39.	2	4	3
xxvii. 46.	2	4	3

MARK.

v. 23.	1	15	8
vi. 5.	1	15	8
x. 45.	1	21	6
	2	6	4
xiv. 33, 34.	2	4	3
61, 62.	2	4	2

LUKE.

i. 10. 21.	1	8	11
10.	2	7	4
iv. 20	1	15	8
xii. 48.	1	21	13
xiii. 13.	1	15	8
32.	1	18	1
xxii. 44.	2	4	3
xxiii. 34.	2	4	3
	2	6	9

JOHN.

i. 17.	1	18	2
ii. 19. 21.	1	3	4
iii. 34.	1	5	3
v. 22. 39. 46.	2	4	2
45—47.	2	7	11
vi. 40.	2	4	2

JOHN.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
viii. 12.	2	4	2
xii. 44. 48.	2	7	11
xiv. 16. 26.	2	7	7
xv. 26.	2	7	7
xvi. 7.	2	7	7
13.	2	4	2
26.	2	7	11
xvii.	2	3	3
1. 19.	2	3	3
2.	2	4	2
17—19.	2	4	4
xviii. 1.	2	3	3

ACTS.

vii. 60.	2	6	9
viii. 18, 19.	1	15	8
xiii. 32, 33.	2	2	3
xvii. 28.	2	7	13
xix. 6.	1	15	8

ROMANS.

i. 38.	1	21	13
iii. 22. 24.	2	6	3
23, 24.	2	6	9
25.	2	6	8
iv. 25.	2	5	4
viii. 26, 27.	2	7	9
33, 34.	2	7	8
34.	2	1	1
xi. 2.	2	7	8
xii. 1.	1	19	12
xv. 16.	1	19	12
17.	1	19	5

I CORINTHIANS.

iii. 6.	1	3	4
v. 8.	1	8	9
19.	2	6	9
21.	2	5	2
vi. 9.	1	3	4

I CORINTHIANS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
x. 1. 11.	1	16	1
20.	1	17	5
xv. 3.	2	6	11
24. 27.....	2	7	13
27.	2	2	9

II CORINTHIANS.

i. 21.	1	5	3
v. 14, 15.	2	4	3
	2	5	9
20.	1	19	4

GALATIANS.

i. 4.	2	6	11
iii. 13.	2	6	6

EPHESIANS.

i. 7.	2	6	2
ii. 19—22.....	1	3	4
v. 2.	1	19	12
	2	4	4

PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 8—11.	2	4	4
	2	7	13
17.	1	19	12
iv. 18.	1	19	12

COLOSSIANS.

i. 14.	2	6	2
24.	2	4	2
ii. 9.	1	3	4
	1	18	3
16, 17.	1	18	2
17.	1	18	1

I TIMOTHY.

ii. 5.	2	7	13
5, 6.	2	6	4
6.	2	6	6. 12

I TIMOTHY.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
ii. 22.	1	15	8
vi. 13.	2	4	2

HEBREWS.

i. 2.	2	2	4
3.	1	21	3
	2	3	1
	2	6	1
	2	7	13
5.	2	6	11
ii. 10.	2	2	5
17.	2	1	4
	2	6	7
	2	7	10
17, 18.	2	2	7
iv. 5.	2	2	4
9, 10.	2	1	4
14—16.....	2	1	4
15, 16.	2	2	7
	2	7	10
v. 1.	1	19	4
1, 2.	2	1	4
1—3.	1	19	3
5.	2	2	8
vi. 2.	1	15	8
vii. 1.	1	4	3
11.	2	1	2
11, 12.	2	2	1
vii. 24—26.....	2	1	4
24, 25.	2	7	8.9
25.	1	19	4
27.	2	6	11
28.	2	1	4
viii. 3.	2	2	3
4.	2	2	2
ix. 7.	1	18	7
11, 12.	1	18	1.6
12.	1	18	7
13.	1	18	2.7
14.	1	18	2.5

HEBREWS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
ix. 15.	2	7	3
	2	6	2, 6
15—17.	2	5	1
22.	2	6	2
22, 23.	1	21	3
23.	1	18	1, 2
24.	1	18	1
	2	1	1
	2	7	3, 5
25.	2	7	3
26.	2	3	1
x. 1.	1	18	1, 2
4.	1	18	7
5—10.	1	18	5
12.	2	3	1
	2	7	1, 3
18. 26.	2	6	11
20.	1	3	4
22.	1	19	4
xi. 4.	1	1	3
xii. 2.	2	2	5
	2	7	13
16.	1	4	1, 2
xiii. 2.	2	4	3
10—12.	1	18	6
	2	6	1
11.	1	17	1
	2	6	11
11, 12.	1	3	5
12.	2	3	1
15, 16.	1	19	12

I PETER.

i. 15.	1	1	1
24.	1	18	1

HEBREWS.

	Dis.	ch.	sec.
ii. 5.	1	19	12
23.	2	4	3
24.	2	5	9, 10
iii. 18.	2	6	11

II PETER.

i. 18.	1	3	2
ii. 5. 7, 8.	1	1	3

I JOHN.

i. 1, 2.	2	1	4
2.	2	7	6
7.	1	21	3
	2	6	1
9.	2	7	10
ii. 1.	2	1	1
1, 2.	2	2	6, 9
	2	7	6, 7
2.	2	6	7
20. 27.	1	5	3
iii. 3.	1	1	1
iv. 10.	2	6	7
v. 8.	2	4	2

JUDE.

14.	1	1	3

REVELATION.

i. 6.	1	5	3
v. 8.	1	18	3
	2	7	4
vi. 9.	1	16	6
viii. 3.	2	7	4
3, 4.	1	18	3
xvi. 6.	1	21	13

NOTES ADDED BY THE TRANSLATOR.

ON the matter of Abel's oblation, page 11.
Reasons for attributing sacrifice to Divine institution, 18---22.
The Hebrew ritual not an imitation of Heathen customs or condescension to Heathen prejudices, 28, 29.
On the two goats offered on the anniversary day of atonement, 97.
Origin of the Latin words *immolo* and *immolatio*, *macto* and *mactatio*, 100.
Quotation from Virgil on libation of wine, 100.
On the meat offering appointed in certain cases, as a substitute for an animal sacrifice, 104, 105.
On the rabbinical enumeration and distribution of the precepts of the law, 125.
Quotation from Xenophon on Holocausts, 127.
Quotation from Livy on public vows, 133.
On an erroneous statement of Philo and Josephus, 159.
The paschal sacrifice generally a lamb, but in some cases a kid, 162.
The paschal sacrifice accompanied by other sacrifices, 162, 163.
Reference to Misna Surenhus, on the construction of the great altar at Jerusalem, 191.
Quotation from Chrysostom on Christ's vicarious sufferings and death, 280.
Comment of Cyril on Christ's words, *I sanctify myself*, 316.
Quotation from Dr. Smith on the imputation of guilt to Christ, 327.
Quotation from Dr. Magee on the term *bearing sins*, 328, 329.
On Isaiah, liii. 4. and Matthew, viii. 17.—p. 337.
Reference to the use of the word ἱλασμος in the Septuagint, 348.
On Remission of sins, 352.
On the value of Christ's satisfaction, 353, 354.
Reference to Dr. Campbell and Schleusner, 371.
On the meaning of the term *reconciliation* in the New Testament, 375, 376.

THE END.

Burton, Clay, & Co. Printers, 9, Devonshire Street, Bishopsgate.

2261 12

3 2044 073 425 894

3 2044 073 425 894

3 2044 073 425 894

3 2044 073 425 894